

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 76th CONGRESS, THIRD SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 1940

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 28, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-living God, before whom the generations come and go, whose mercies are infinite, whose love is eternal: We beseech Thee to bless our country and help us here and now to advance the onward march of Thy kingdom of right and justice by the increase of our devotion to our national ideals and the reign of law and self-discipline.

Thou has shown us Thy ways and we have forsaken them; Thou hast brought us to great honor and we have wearied of Thy service; nevertheless, we beseech Thee to spare us from adversity and restore to us the vision lost in paths apart from Thee. Grant to us such calm and measured wisdom in all our deliberations, that confidence may everywhere prevail, that our people may be of one mind and one purpose in fulfilling the destiny unto which Thou dost call us. We ask it in the name of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Wednesday, June 12, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 51) authorizing the enrollment with an amendment of the bill (S. 2598) for the relief of Kurt Wessely.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6207. An act to amend section 2810 (a), Internal Revenue Code, to exclude petroleum stills from the requirement of registration; and

H. R. 10055. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

LXXXVI—511

S. 1024. An act for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher;

S. 3578. An act for the relief of Edward Smith;

H. R. 6044. An act to regulate the number of warrant and commissioned warrant officers in the Marine Corps;

H. R. 8026. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9209. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9848. An act to authorize the construction or acquisition of naval aircraft, the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahey	Lodge	Sheppard
Andrews	Downey	Lucas	Shipstead
Ashurst	Ellender	Lundeen	Slattery
Austin	George	McKellar	Smith
Bailey	Gerry	McNary	Stewart
Bankhead	Gillette	Maloney	Taft
Barkley	Green	Mead	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Guffey	Miller	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gurney	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Hale	Murray	Tobey
Brown	Harrison	Neely	Townsend
Bulow	Hatch	Norris	Truman
Burke	Hayden	Nye	Tydings
Byrnes	Herring	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Capper	Hill	Overton	Van Nuys
Caraway	Holman	Pepper	Wagner
Chandler	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	White
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	Wiley
Connally	King	Russell	
Danaher	La Follette	Schwartz	
Davis	Lee	Schwellenbach	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent from the Senate because of illness in his family.

The Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are necessarily detained.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is unavoidably detained on official duties.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

8123

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the Board of Education, Niagara Falls, N. Y., requesting that certain appropriations be made for the United States Office of Education to be allocated to State departments of education and local communities to cover the costs of a program of vocational training designed to prepare workers for employment in essential war industries, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Board of Education, Niagara Falls, N. Y., offering the facilities of the Trott Vocational School to the New York State Department of Education and the United States Office of Education to be used as a center for training workers in essential war industries, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate the petition of the Allied Marine Contractors Association, New York City, N. Y., praying that the United States promptly render all possible assistance to the allied nations by furnishing them with necessary equipment in the present war situation, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also laid before the Senate resolutions of the Lions Clubs, of Greenwood, S. C., and Amarillo, Tex., endorsing the national-defense program and favoring the immediate enactment of legislation to stop subversive activities of citizens or aliens and the agents of foreign nations in the United States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a petition from the president and members of the Pottstown (Pa.) Chamber of Commerce Minute Men, praying that Congress remain in session during the present emergency, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also laid before the Senate a telegram in the nature of a petition from the Georgia Congress of Parents and Teachers, Atlanta, Ga., praying for the enactment of the so-called Norris-Sparkman bill, providing for tax replacement in connection with the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority to each county and school district in Georgia lying in the Tennessee Valley, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TYDINGS presented the petition of the monthly meeting of the Society of Friends, Park Avenue, Baltimore, Md., praying for the adoption of certain peace measures as drafted by the National Peace Conference, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. TOWNSEND (for Mr. BARBOUR) presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Whereas the port of New York Authority has reported after extensive research and investigation that a drydock adequate for the largest naval and mercantile ships is a vital need in the port of New York; and

Whereas several sites on the New Jersey side of the port of New York have been mentioned in the said report as possible locations for the said drydock; and

Whereas the New Jersey side by reason of its superior natural advantages is ideally situated for such purposes; and

Whereas the interests of the whole port of New York and of the Nation will be best served by the construction of a drydock and shipyard on the New Jersey side of the port: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the senate concurring):

1. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey urges and petitions the Congress of the United States, the Navy Department, and the port of New York Authority to recognize the superior natural advantages of the New Jersey side of the port of New York, and to authorize at the earliest possible time, the establishment of a drydock and shipyard on the New Jersey side of the port of New York adequate for the largest naval and mercantile ships.

2. A copy of this concurrent resolution duly authenticated by the speaker of the house of assembly and attested by the clerk of the assembly be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in Congress, the Navy Department, and the Port of New York Authority.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. TOWNSEND (for Mr. BARBOUR also) presented the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

An assembly concurrent resolution memorializing Congress and the War Department of the United States to operate Central Airport, Camden, N. J., as an integral part of the United States defense program

Whereas a national-defense program is now under consideration to include the construction of 50,000 additional airplanes and the training of additional fliers; and

Whereas there is located in the township of Pensauken, adjacent to the city of Camden, N. J., an airport which has been used for 10 years as a base for the largest air lines and a landing field for the largest airplanes; and

Whereas this airport known as Central Airport has achieved a national reputation for safety, a point emphasized as recently as Friday, May 31, when 37 large airplanes, unable to reach La Guardia Field, N. Y., because of heavy fog, took haven at Central Airport; and

Whereas the opening of the Philadelphia Municipal Airport has caused commercial air lines to transfer their Philadelphia district base from Central Airport to Philadelphia Airport by July 1, 1940, with the result that the closing of Central Airport on that date has been announced; and

Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Authority, in a report published last year, estimated that 3,500 modern airports are necessary for civilian use under its expanded training program, even without regard to wartime needs; that airport facilities are so meager with only 20 Army and Navy air bases in the entire country that the United States could not even begin to cope with an aerial war and that the President's goal of 50,000 planes manufactured per year hardly will be worth achieving unless a comprehensive program of airport construction is begun immediately; and

Whereas Central Airport has many natural advantages, including its excellent location, sufficiently inland from the Atlantic seaboard to be protected and yet close enough to make an ideally situated base; easily accessible to freight, trucking, and shipping service and yet far enough from the Delaware River to escape the worst fogs; strategically located to defend the Philadelphia metropolitan area, and thoroughly equipped for a training field, with available land to the east and north for enlargement if deemed advisable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the senate concurring):

1. That the Congress and War Department of the United States be urged to take over the operation of the Central Airport in Pensauken Township, Camden County, N. J., as a training field for student fliers or in any other manner deemed important to the national defense; to prevent the abandonment of an adequate, well-equipped, excellently located airport in light of the proposed program and to remedy the shortage of airport facilities in this country; and

2. That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the United States Senators from New Jersey, to each Member of the House of Representatives from New Jersey, to the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. KING, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which were referred the following bills and joint resolution, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 3870. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to furnish Potomac water without charge to charitable institutions, etc., in the District of Columbia," approved February 23, 1905 (Rept. No. 1838);

S. 3993. A bill to authorize employees of the United States to testify on behalf of the District of Columbia and employees of the District of Columbia to testify on behalf of the United States and of the District of Columbia without loss of salary or annual leave (Rept. No. 1839);

S. 4048. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth P. Peeples (Rept. No. 1840);

H. R. 9633. A bill to enlarge and extend the power and jurisdiction of the Board of Education over degree-conferring institutions operating within the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1841); and

H. J. Res. 559. Joint resolution authorizing a reduction in the rate of interest to be paid on certain loans and advances made to the District of Columbia by the United States of

America through the Public Works Administration (Rept. No. 1842).

Mr. KING also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 9114. A bill authorizing advancements from the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works for the construction of a recorder of deeds building in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1843); and

H. R. 9791. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act (Rept. No. 1844).

Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 8815. A bill to grant per diem compensation to the appointed members of the Board of Steam and Other Operating Engineers of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1845); and

H. R. 9804. A bill to amend and clarify section 6, subsection 2, of the act approved June 1, 1938, known as Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1846).

Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 3720) to create and establish a Board of Funeral Directors and Embalmers for the District of Columbia and to prescribe its powers and duties, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1847) thereon.

Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9299) to amend section 10 of chapter 5 of Public Act No. 436, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 19, 1934, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1848) thereon.

Mr. OVERTON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9907) to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1849) thereon.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 7865. A bill to amend the act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto, approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereof (Rept. No. 1850); and

H. R. 8692. A bill to amend the act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1851).

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9117) to eliminate the tax on brandy and wine spirits used in the fortification of wine; to increase the tax on wine; to compensate for the loss of revenue occasioned by the elimination of the tax on brandy and wine spirits used in the fortification of wine; and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1853) thereon.

TREATMENT OF IMPORTED NARCISSUS BULBS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted a report (No. 1852) to accompany the resolution (S. Res. 280) requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to issue an order concerning the treatment of imported narcissus bulbs submitted and also reported without amendment by Mr. SCHWELLENBACH from that committee on the 12th instant.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 12, 1940, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1560. An act for the relief of Amos B. Cole;

S. 2013. An act to amend the Code of the District of Columbia to provide for the organization and regulation of cooperative associations, and for other purposes;

S. 2782. An act for the relief of Harold W. Kinderman;

S. 3683. An act to remove the time limit for cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Farm Security Administration in the development of farm units on public lands under Federal reclamation projects; and

S. 3813. An act to authorize the presentation of a special gold medal to William Sinnott.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 4134. A bill for the relief of John G. Hunter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 4135. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Board of Georgia to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Withlacoochee River, between Valdosta, Ga., and Madison, Fla., at or near Horns Ferry; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 4136. A bill for the relief of Herbert G. Fearey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 4137. A bill relating to transportation of foreign mail by aircraft; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 6207. An act to amend section 2810 (a), Internal Revenue Code, to exclude petroleum stills from the requirement of registration; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 10055. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PURCHASE BY R. F. C. OF STOCK OF FEDERAL HOME-LOAN BANKS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WAGNER submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3938) to authorize the purchase by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation of stock of Federal home-loan banks; to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES G. DAWES ON THE NEXT PRESIDENT AND THE NATIONAL BUDGET

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Gen. Charles G. Dawes on April 30, 1940, before the twenty-eighth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C., on the subject, The Next President and the National Budget, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM POWER MALONEY AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES AT FISK UNIVERSITY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by William Power Maloney at the commencement exercises held at Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn., on June 3, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

TO THE BRINK, EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To the Brink," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Tuesday, June 11, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S ROLE—EDITORIAL FROM BOSTON TRANSCRIPT

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Boston Transcript entitled "America's Role," which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY DR. WILLIAM J. THOMPSON AT DOWNINGTOWN, PA.

[Mr. MINTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Dr. William J. Thompson, recorder of deeds for the District of Columbia, at the Community Day exercises of the Downingtown Industrial and Agricultural School, at Downingtown, Pa., on May 19, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICANISM AND IMMIGRATION

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated July 2, 1939, with an enclosed article from the Sunday Mirror of July 2, 1939, the article being entitled "Test Shows Many Afraid to Display Americanism Signs," which appear in the Appendix.]

AIRPLANES FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by John T. Flynn and published May 22, 1940, under the headline "Plain economics," which appears in the Appendix.]

RELATIONS WITH JAPAN

[Mr. SCHWELLENBACH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Daily News of June 13, 1940, by Raymond Clapper, entitled "No Deal With Japan," which appears in the Appendix.]

SEISMOLOGY IN CONNECTICUT—ARTICLE BY EDWARD L. TROXELL

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Edward L. Troxell entitled "Seismology in Connecticut," which appears in the Appendix.]

STEPPING TOWARD WAR—EDITORIAL FROM SIOUX FALLS ARGUS LEADER

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix an editorial, entitled "Stepping Toward War," published in the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus Leader of June 11, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREPAREDNESS PLATFORM

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article prepared by Basil Brewer, publisher, of New Bedford, Mass., entitled "Preparedness Platform," Standard-Times Mercury of May 31, 1940, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LEGION CALLED THE TURN—EDITORIAL FROM NATIONAL LEGIONNAIRE

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the National Legionnaire of June 1940 entitled "The Legion Called the Turn," which appears in the Appendix.]

MILITARY AND NAVAL EXPENDITURES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BROWN

[Mr. SCHWARTZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from a radio address delivered by Senator BROWN on May 28, 1940, in reference to present and past military and naval expenditures, which appears in the Appendix.]

PURCHASE OF FOREIGN SILVER

[Mr. TOWNSEND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article regarding the buying of foreign silver, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 544) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941.

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the Senate recessed yesterday there was no amendment pending. The question is on the third reading and engrossment of the joint resolution. The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] has notified the Chair that he desires to address the Senate. Having had that notice, and the Senator from California being on his feet, the Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

SENATORIAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, yesterday I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 279) providing for the appointment and composition of a special committee of the United States Senate, to remain here in Washington from day to day in the

event of adjournment or recess of the Congress. First, I desire to state that the submission of that resolution is no admission on my part that I think the Congress should adjourn. On the contrary, if a motion to adjourn is presented, my vote shall be cast against it. I desire, however, very briefly to present to the Senate today a discussion of the resolution I have submitted, because of the extreme possibility that a resolution for final adjournment may be presented sometime next week and hurriedly passed by Congress without any opportunity for an argument upon the pending resolution.

In order that Senators may be thoroughly informed of the nature of the resolution I have submitted, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read the resolution at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 279) submitted by Mr. DOWNEY on June 12, 1940, was read as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby established a special committee to be known as the Senatorial Coordinating Committee to consist of 21 Senators, 3 of each from the following standing committees of the Senate and appointed by the chairmen thereof: Appropriations, Banking and Currency, Finance, Foreign Relations, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, and Post Offices and Post Roads. The special committee shall select a chairman from among its members. Any vacancy in the special committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee and shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

The members of the special committee shall remain at the seat of Government during any recess or adjourned period of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and shall meet each weekday during any such period.

It shall be the duty of the special committee (1) to confer with and give advice to the President or his duly authorized representatives on matters relating to the existing world and national crisis, (2) whenever the committee deems it advisable, to recommend to the President that Congress be called into special session, and (3) to consider and investigate such matters as the existing emergency may present, including (a) the best methods of fostering friendly relations, commerce, and understanding among the nations of the Western Hemisphere, and providing for the defense of the peoples of such nations, their territorial boundaries, and their governmental sovereignties; (b) the best means of restoring the American people to full employment and the operation of their industries to full capacity; (c) the best methods of rebuilding the highways in the United States so that they may be effectively adapted to national safety, defense, commerce, and traffic; (d) the best methods of providing adequate financing for the future defense of the Western Hemisphere; (e) the advisability and best methods of shaping our national economy so that it may be self-sufficient in essential war materials; and (f) the best plan to be adopted to guard against so-called "fifth column" activities and the best way to mobilize our people, industries, and resources for the defense of this country and such other areas in the Western Hemisphere as may be deemed advisable.

The special committee shall make reports of its findings and recommendations to the President and the Senate at such times as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the special committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, first I desire to make clear to the Members of the Senate that this resolution is in no way a reflection upon the Chief Executive of the Nation or upon our executive branch, but it is an implied criticism of the failure of the American Government to meet the problems developing in the past 2 years, including the Chief Executive, the Army, the Navy, and the Congress of the United States.

I shall now say some things that may perhaps seem harsh. I say them, not merely to be critical, but because I believe it is essential that we, the representatives of the American Government, shall awaken to action out of the apathy that has gripped us for the past 2 or 3 years.

Preliminary to that, I should like to recall to the Senators here that the first month I entered the Senate of the United States I attended a joint meeting of the Military Affairs Committees of the House and the Senate. We there heard

our two ambassadors to Great Britain and to France outline to us the military conditions existing in Germany, in France, and in England; and they then and there prophesied to us the coming of almost exactly what has happened in the past 60 days. They told us not only what would happen when this war began in earnest, but they told us why it would happen; and yet, with every governmental representative knowing exactly the military strength of the combatants in Europe, we apparently are surprised, excited, and shocked, and almost in a hysteria, because the war has turned out just the way we should have known it would turn out.

Ambassadors Kennedy and Bullitt told us that the air power of Germany was so great, and the air power of her adversaries so inadequate, that France and Great Britain could not withstand Germanic military assaults. As a matter of fact, they prophesied that the war would not last very long before both Paris and London would be compelled to capitulate or face destruction.

Mr. President, I understand now that our intelligence services at Berlin, London, and Paris have filled the archives of our Government with reports of the great mechanized instrumentalities of Germany and the weakness of France and Great Britain, showing that nothing could have happened in this war save what has happened. And let us not forget that more than 2 years ago Charles Lindbergh warned the world of the accelerating air power of Germany, but his warning was ignored, or at least it did not spur either France, England, or the American Government to energetic action.

Mr. President, in the face of those facts, why this hysteria and confusion when the war has resulted the way all of the military prophets said it would result? I might say that the President of the United States stated to me—and it is no violation of ethics when I say it, because he proclaimed it in the press—that the military power of Germany was so great that the overwhelming odds were in favor of Germany winning this war. Yet, knowing all those facts for 2 years, have we prepared ourselves adequately either for operations at home or abroad to meet this crisis? We have not.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I had the honor to attend the meeting of which the able Senator speaks, and I heard the statements made by these two Ambassadors and can testify to the absolute correctness of the able Senator's statement.

May I say that since 1919, 21 years ago, I have not only advocated supremacy in the air, and voted for the 6,000 planes when we had before the Senate a bill looking to that end some time ago, and a separate department of the air, which Germany has, Britain has, France has, and Japan and all the other great nations have. I am glad this subject is being brought to the attention of the country.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the able Senator from Minnesota who though he has consistently opposed our intervention in Europe has vigilantly urged national defense.

My reason for making the remarks I am making is not merely that I desire to be critical. I say that we are just as blind and apathetic today toward what we should undertake for the future as we were blind and apathetic 2 years ago as to what we should have been doing during the intervening 2 years.

I desire also to make this statement, that there has never been any conflict over national preparedness between Senators who believe in intervention in European affairs and those who believe in isolation or "continental insulation," if you prefer. While I myself voted against the President's program at the last extraordinary session, at that very time and in that session I urged that reasonable vigilance required the immediate preparation of an air fleet of from 25,000 to 50,000 planes, quoting Mr. Lindbergh and Eddie Rickenbacker, and our other war experts, as authorities on that subject.

That my own attitude on preparedness may be clear, I want here to quote from my remarks in the Senate at the special session last year on October 9, 1939. I would avoid the charge

of hysteria, and therefore assert that the position I am now assuming is fundamentally the position I occupied 2 years ago.

Of course, I admit freely that I have been surprised and alarmed at the power of Germanic military might and believe we should accelerate our own defensive mechanism to meet all possible eventualities that may reasonably be expected in view of world conditions now known to exist.

My remarks, to which I have adverted, at the special session were as follows:

[Excerpt from Senator DOWNEY's 7-hour senatorial speech of October 9, 1939]

Mr. President, there is a wide difference of opinion among military experts themselves as to how efficient our Army is. The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD], after long experience as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, has assured me that he believes within 6 months we will be able to mobilize and have properly equipped from four to five hundred thousand first-class troops. Most of them could be assembled within 30 or 60 days. Many of the military men point out—and I think correctly—that we lack certain arms, certain ammunition, certain mobile artillery, and certain other implements of war for the greatest efficiency. So far as I am concerned, as a Member of the Senate, let me say to the military men of America: Make us safe against any foreign aggression without weakly counting upon the support of any other nation that well may fail us when we vitally need help. Whatever we ought to do by way of preparation we should do. And Congress, of course, must be guided by its military advisers. How idiotic we would be if, like the statesmen of European empires, we should allow ourselves to be overbuilt so that we could truly be said to be the prey of reasonable apprehension and fear. Whatever amount we have to spend for the protection of our people against foreign aggression should be cheerfully spent. Of course, I hate to say it, but I must say that such expenditures should come ahead of every other expenditure, even expenditures for the unhappy submerged half of the population, because, after all, national defense is the supreme necessity of all.

Colonel Lindbergh and our great war ace, Eddie Rickenbacker, have suggested that if we had 25,000 more military airplanes, then even the most timid and hysterical citizen in America would know that we were absolutely safe, because the first submarine, the first war vessel, the first soldier that came in a belligerent way within 500 miles of the Western Hemisphere would be destroyed overnight by our many airplanes. Some Senators may ask, "But what would be the cost of 25,000 airplanes?" I say to you it would be negligible.

I have secured from one of the great airplane companies—I must keep the name in confidence, because the information was so given to me, but I take it that any company would verify these figures—that with an expenditure of \$250,000,000 we could build factories which would produce 3,000 first-class planes every month. I do not know whether or not Mr. Rickenbacker is right that we ought actually to build 25,000 planes, of which we are already building 5,500, but, in any event, I think the Government should undertake the financing of private airplane companies to build those factories, and let them stand as notice to the world that the first hostile vessel, the first submarine, the first soldier that dares to undertake aggressions in the Western Hemisphere will start the operation of those factories at full capacity.

One can easily see the immense value of an air force of twenty-five or fifty thousand planes. It could fly 25,000 or 50,000 soldiers to any point in the Western Hemisphere almost within a day. They could strike at any submarine bases. They could mobilize overnight to protect the whole Western Hemisphere. Who is so deluded as to suggest that we should fight battles in Europe to protect our western safety, with the loss of millions of lives and billions upon billions of dollars, when we can make ourselves invulnerable in the Western Hemisphere for a comparatively small amount, and be thereby assured no one will attack us?

(P. 379, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 9, 1939.)

I am here appealing to the Senate of the United States to use its initiative and its high ability in the critical years which lie ahead, and that is why I want to point out, Mr. President, that for the last 20 years 9 out of 10 American citizens in the highways and the byways of our land have said that in the next great war the air power would be a tremendous instrument of offense and defense, 9 out of 10 of the laymen of America have said, "Why in heaven's name do we not appropriate substantial sums for our defense."

I have talked with Senators here over the past 2 years, I have heard them expressing themselves in the Committee on Military Affairs, and almost every Senator has made the same statement, that we should be investing more money in air-dromes, the training of pilots, and in airplanes. But the Senate has never manifested its own will and wish in these matters.

When the airplane bill came before the Committee on Military Affairs, did that committee refuse what the President of

the United States or the military officials asked? No. Most of the committee thought their request was too small; some took the position that we could not hope to get anything more than might be requested by the executive department. Some believed we should accept without question the judgment of the Executive and military.

I say it is high time that the Congress, more directly representing the common-sense judgment of all our people than any other branch of our Government, should make its will, energy, and talent felt in our governmental operations.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Just to make the record straight, I think it will be shown that for the last 4 or 5 years, perhaps longer, the Congress has approved every appropriation for the Army and for the Navy and for the air force which the President and the Bureau of the Budget have sent to us. While many have thought that their requests were too small, nevertheless, whatever has been asked for has been written into law.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Maryland for that contribution, and I am sure he is correct, that every dollar of appropriation that has been asked by the Executive of Congress for military preparedness has been granted, and I think more, too.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I am a member. Did the Senator attend the joint committee meeting when Ambassadors Bullitt and Kennedy appeared before us?

Mr. DOWNEY. I did.

Mr. MINTON. And the Senator criticized what was expressed by those men at that time—that Germany was in a position to win the war if they got into one. Did not the Senator do that?

Mr. DOWNEY. I am very sure I did not, though I do not know to just what the Senator refers. But let me answer his question in this way: It is true that I left that meeting amazed, questioning, and shocked, and wondering whether the statement given to us by the Ambassadors of the overwhelming military superiority of Germany was correct or whether it was for some reason exaggerated. But the President of the United States and the Intelligence Department of the United States knew whether or not those statements were true. I afterward came to believe they were wholly accurate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me point out to the Senator that for 4 or 5 years, at least that long, almost every government on the face of the earth has been informed of what was taking place in Germany. There have been perhaps four or five hundred books written on the subject, and in the last 2 or 3 years many of these books have been among the best sellers. Without attempting to escape any of the responsibility which, as the Senator well points out, falls upon Congress, because, after all, it is the legislative arm of the United States, there has not been any considerable thought in this country that any damage could be done here. We have been under the illusion that the Atlantic and the Pacific were as wide as they were 200 years ago, in spite of all the evidence. I am glad to see the Senator raising his voice today, because the information to which he alludes as to the strength of Germany's planes has been in the hands of this Government for 5 years, 4 years, 3 years, 2 years, and 1 year, as it has been in the hands of the French, the Polish, the Hungarians, the Czechoslovakian and all the other governments.

Colonel Lindbergh returned from Europe and gave some exposition of the air power of Germany. We have known about it all along. But the thought was that, no matter what happened in the whole world, we would not have to do any preparing here, even though we would not intervene, that we did not have to prepare here. The Senator is right; we should have had our ears open long before, and should have acted

long before, and we would not have been so jittery and nervous today.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. KING. I think we were justified, perhaps, in relying upon statements so often made by Mr. Hitler, that when he obtained Austria and when he obtained Danzig he would have no other territorial conquests in mind, that he was satisfied with the delimitations upon the Rhine, and that when he acquired those territories he would be satisfied. He assured Mr. Chamberlain of that fact. I did not believe his representations, but many people in Europe and many people in the United States believed Mr. Hitler was sincere. Obviously he was not. He simply was bent upon deceiving the people of Europe, as well as the people of the United States, by his subtle methods, and in the meantime he was preparing the most formidable military machine the world has ever seen. Now we are witnessing the result of the inertia and the laissez faire policy of many European governments, if not our own.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator from Utah for his fine contribution. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Anyone who has read Mein Kampf, by Mr. Hitler himself, knows he is very frank in stating what he is going to do. His first plan was to harmonize all the German people in every country in the world, no matter where they were situated, and after he had worked them into a whole, with allegiance to the fatherland, he uses this expression:

When we have done that, we can then settle our hunger for colonies.

Mr. Hitler said first he was going east; that he was not going west. Then he went west. So we cannot excuse ourselves on the ground that we have believed Mr. Hitler, because there have been a great many contradictions in the last 4 years between what Mr. Hitler has said and what he has done. The whole truth of the matter is that we have always assumed that, no matter what happened in Asia or in Europe, we did not need to prepare in this country even to defend ourselves; that the Atlantic Ocean and the Pacific Ocean, with a navy, were all we needed. That is why we are situated as we are today, and there is no other excuse, in my judgment.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator for his very able contribution.

Mr. President, one of the issues I should like to present to the Senate, to be considered by the proposed committee if it should be appointed, is involved in the question of the strategic war materials.

I have no desire to discuss the policy of trade reciprocity generally, but let me say to the Senate that any nation that allows itself to depend upon the production of its strategic war materials from points five and ten thousand miles away, across the distant oceans, has placed itself in a position where it might, overnight, receive a blow to its financial, business, industrial, and defense structures that will rock them to their very foundation.

I know, as the President of the United States has recently informed us, that we are now scouring the earth in a wild and largely futile search to bring in what scanty hoards of tin, rubber, manganese, and other strategic materials we can. We are now trying to do in the course of a few months what we should have done over the course of years. Nine out of ten American citizens have proclaimed the wisdom of gathering strategic war materials; hundreds of our veteran and civic organizations have urged it. Bernard Baruch and Hugh Johnson vehemently have proclaimed the vital necessity of such action for years, but the Government has done nothing.

Let us consider the facts to show how grossly careless we have been. On January 1 of this year we actually had in the United States 92,000 tons of crude rubber—less than we had 1 year before. With the world aflame, with our own

Chief Executive cautioning us to take every vigilant step, we allowed our supply of crude rubber, which may become vital for our national existence, to depreciate to the lowest level that it has been in any recent year, and we were just as grossly careless with tin and other essential military supplies.

I take it that Mr. Stettinius, in whom I have the greatest confidence, is right now doing everything he can to gather from the four corners of the earth tin and rubber, and other metals and chemicals, whose lack might almost paralyze us if their supplies are cut off.

Mr. President, I say that this Nation, if it values its national existence and welfare, should tomorrow begin to go beyond that, and to shape its economy to produce synthetic materials and substitutes for tin and rubber and manganese and other military essentials that possibly, within 6 months, we will not be able to get from our accustomed sources.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I may call the Senate's attention to the resolution introduced a long time ago by the able minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], dealing with strategic war materials. It proposed an exchange of these necessary war materials for the billions of unpaid war debts due us from the Allies.

Nothing was done about that resolution. For months I have been asking that we acquire strategic war materials and apply them on the debts owing to us by the dearly beloved countries known as the Allies that we are worrying so much about, but nothing has been done about it. Let these great empires turn over their West Indian island bases to us. That is one method of real defense. Let them turn over strategic war materials and receive due credit on the debts owing to America from our advances to them in the first World War.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his valued contribution to the discussion.

Mr. President, let me say that for the last 2 or 3 months I have done some study upon this question of lack of war materials in America, and the tremendous difficulty in rapidly building factories to produce substitutes and synthetics for our strategic war materials, I wish to say, without being an alarmist, because I do not want to be alarming to the Nation, that there are vast difficulties lying ahead of the American Nation if within the next year our supply of tin and rubber from the Dutch East Indies and Malaya is cut off. I do not say that those difficulties cannot be surmounted by American genius and talent. They can be. They will be, I am sure. But I say to the Senate that our failure to develop factories for the production of our own war supplies, our failure to lay in stock piles of strategic war materials, has been a grievous mistake. Let us make a few more such errors, and we will be out on the same kind of desperate stormy waves that now engulf the empires of France and Great Britain.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to ask the Senator from California if he recalls—I do not myself recall—what happened to the bill relating to the acquisition of strategic war materials. I know we passed a bill relating to strategic war materials. That bill, as I recall, encountered considerable difficulty before it was passed by the Congress of the United States. How did the bill, as passed, compare to the bill as it was introduced? Does the Senator from California recall that?

Mr. DOWNEY. The history of that bill was as follows: The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] was the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs which handled this question. I desire to compliment the Senator from Utah for the splendid battle he put up attempting to provide this Nation with strategic war materials, even though he was unsuccessful. The Senator from Utah has told me that from information given him by Mr. Baruch, from his own study and experience, he became convinced years ago that

in our lack of tin, rubber, manganese, quinine, and other strategic war materials, there existed a dangerous defect in our war economy. The Senator from Utah, from the Military Affairs Subcommittee, reported a bill calling for the appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the purchase of strategic war materials. There were several Senators on the Military Affairs Committee who had known that the War Department had expressed a desire for three or four hundred million dollars, and they said to the Senator from Utah, "Why not appropriate \$250,000,000 or more?" The Senator from Utah said, "It will not do you any good. I do not believe that we can even get this measure passed, which provides for \$25,000,000 a year for 4 years, or \$100,000,000 in total. If we ask for any more we shall certainly fail."

After a statement of that kind the Military Affairs Committee reported to the Senate the strategic war materials bill calling for the appropriation of \$25,000,000 a year for a period of 4 years. The bill did not pass in that form. There was a long argument in respect to the bill. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] finally offered an amendment to the bill to reduce the amount from \$25,000,000 per year to \$10,000,000 per year, and upon a very close vote that proposal was adopted. Even with the assurance of the Senator from South Carolina that the President of the United States would not use the \$25,000,000, and did not want it, still there were only 33 Senators who voted for the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Carolina while 31 voted against it.

I have here the statement made by the Senator from South Carolina at the time, and I will read it, since the Senator from New Mexico has asked for the information. This is taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 30, 1939, page 3534:

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "\$25,000,000" and to insert "\$10,000,000."

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, the question of the purchase of critical and strategic materials has been before the Committee on Appropriations for several years, particularly under consideration by an able subcommittee.

I have communicated with the officials of the War Department, who state that the President has said that should the pending bill be passed he would not submit an estimate for more than \$10,000,000 for this purpose. I have conferred with the Director of the Budget, who made the same statement to me.

I, therefore, submit to the Senate that it would be unwise to authorize the appropriation of the sum of \$25,000,000 a year, or a total of \$100,000,000.

On the strength of that statement, many of the economy-minded Republicans voting with the Senator from South Carolina, and many of the Roosevelt-minded Senators voting against the amendment and against the alleged wishes of the President, the amendment was carried. It went into conference. Under the direction of an able representative whom I saw in the Senate Chamber a few minutes ago, in the conference the amount was lifted to \$20,000,000 a year for 4 years, but when the Budget estimate came to the Appropriations Committee it called for only \$10,000,000, and that was the amount granted by the Appropriations Committee.

I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that I believe that is the history of the legislation.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. I was going to suggest to the Senator from New Mexico that when the strategic-materials bill was voted on in the Senate, the Senator from California was not present.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, Mr. President; I was not present. On that afternoon we had a public hearing here in Washington of vital importance to the State of California, which I had to attend. I realize my own faults and limitations of time and space. I realize that every Senator here acts under great handicaps in endeavoring to carry on the work for his State, to do his political errands, his duties for his constituents, and to perform his other Federal duties.

No, Mr. President; I was not present and probably I am to be censured for that. But it made no difference, because, though the amount was increased in conference, the Bureau of the Budget did not even then avail itself of the added money.

Mr. President, I am not saying this to be critical and harsh. I am saying this for the reason that there is a grave possibility that 3 months, or 6 months, or a year from now, some condition may arise in Asiatic waters that will close to us our present rubber and tin supply. We can get ready for that now by beginning to find substitutes and synthetic materials. But let no Senator think it does not mean tremendous problems for business and industry to accomplish what must and should immediately be done. And the solution of the many problems that will arise in our own production of synthetic war materials will require the prompt and energetic action of both the Chief Executive and Congress.

I, for one, Mr. President, do not believe that job will be promptly undertaken and carried out unless it is initiated by the Congress of the United States, whose primary duty it is. I have no doubt of the large energy and high ability of Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Knudsen and the other members of the President's Emergency Defense Council who are now performing most valuable services for the United States, but they cannot wholly take over the duties of Congress in such vital respects as this. Consequently, Mr. President, I say to the Senate that if we adjourn or take a recess, a committee of Senators should certainly remain in Washington to familiarize themselves with the situation, to investigate, and to make plans for what lies ahead. If we do not do so, if we continue to follow the deluded path and the apathy of Mr. Chamberlain, there is at least a probability that we may ultimately meet with the same fate as the unfortunate opponents of Germany.

Mr. President, I am not prophesying that Germanic armies will undertake the conquest of the United States. I hope not. I pray not. Probably not; but in national defense the worst should be anticipated, and the most destructive possibilities should be guarded against. The worst we can anticipate in this respect is the cutting off of our supplies of tin, rubber, and manganese. Let us not lose a single day in acting upon the assumption that that will occur, and doing the best we can to meet the situation.

Mr. President, I shall not speak any further upon that provision of my resolution. I have no desire to be an alarmist. I should very much have preferred to present this matter solely in the executive session of some committee and thereafter in Congress but if the expected adjournment of Congress takes place that action would be futile unless this committee is created. Hence this statement on the hazardous position of the American people arising from our lack of war materials.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Before the Senator leaves this particular part of his subject, I wonder if he recalls the fact that during the months of September, October, November, and December Russia became the No. 1 customer of the United States for the strategic and critical materials to which he refers, including molybdenum, gasoline, oil, tin, and rubber. In fact, exports of the latter two commodities became so voluminous that in January Assistant Secretary of War Johnson and Secretary of the Navy Edison were obliged to issue a pronouncement calling upon American exporters not to export any more tin or rubber to Russia, for the reason that an emergency had been created in this country, and that less than 6 weeks' supply was on hand. Whatever the policy of the Government was over that period when Russia became our No. 1 customer for such materials, let it also be noted by the Senator from California that the Neutrality Act and its embargo provisions were applied to Poland, Germany, England, and France, then to Denmark, Norway, Holland, and Belgium, and finally to Italy, but never to Russia.

Mr. DOWNEY. I appreciate very much the contribution of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that when we first started the W. P. A. movement I suggested to the War Department and to the W. P. A. that we create some stock piles of manganese. I called attention to the fact that a great amount of manganese was produced in my home city of Butte, and neighboring cities. I called attention to the fact that those who owned the manganese mines were perfectly willing to go ahead and mine it and stack it, at a cost which would be the minimum cost plus about 6 percent; that they could use a large number of W. P. A. workers, put men to work, and at the same time build up a great stock pile of manganese so that we would not be dependent on foreign countries. The War Department and some of the other departments were very much in favor of the idea, but we were unable to get anything done with reference to the matter.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. President, when the realization came to the American people a few short weeks ago—and apparently likewise to our executive department and our Army and Navy—that we had better begin to prepare to defend North America and the United States, I suppose everyone would concede that the most immediate duty before us was provision for pilots, airplanes, tanks, arms, artillery, and ammunition. I have no doubt that under the very able War Advisory Council appointed by the President, that duty is now being energetically and ably performed. Mr. Knudsen is a great industrial genius, beyond doubt. Mr. Stettinius is likewise of highest character and ability. Indeed, all of the personnel of the Council is of the very highest caliber.

We are also fortunate in the United States in having great industrial corporations such as the General Motors and the United States Steel with which Messrs Stettinius and Knudsen are connected. In these, and others like them, is found the greatest technical skill and organization genius in mass production in all the world. I think the Germans have been a great people in production, but I still think that American technicians, engineers, and industrial leaders are the best in the world. It should be heartening to the American people to hear the statements of Mr. Ford and his son Edsel of their ability to manufacture airplanes. I have no doubt that they are capable of following promise with performance.

It was called to Mr. Sloan's attention that some military men were disturbed about where the Army might get twenty-five or fifty thousand trucks immediately. Mr. Sloan called the attention of the public to the fact that General Motors turned out 200,000 trucks a year ordinarily, and could speed up to produce twenty-five or fifty thousand more without the installation of one new machine and, I doubt not, with the employment of only a few more workers.

I think, Mr. President, when once we can mobilize our great industrial corporations, our technical leaders, and the rank and file of American workers, the most loyal and ablest body of workers, I believe, in the world, we will have no difficulty getting into tremendous mass production to meet any aggression against this continent.

So, Mr. President, my attention has been turned rather to some other problems. What are "Achilles' Heels" of our defense here in the United States? The first, the lack of essential war materials produced on this continent, I have already discussed. What is the second? I take it, it is the problem which has arisen because we have not used prompt and vigorous means to build up the harmonious cooperation with Mexico that we should.

I have no doubt that many internal disturbances will sweep the continents of North and South America within the next 2 or 3 years. I have no desire to discuss that subject on the floor of the Senate, but I do desire to point out that if we would take prompt, fair, generous means to tie the people of Mexico in with the people of the United States in the same sort of relationship that exists between our people and the Canadians, all the nations of North America would thereby incomparably better their defensive positions. As a matter of fact, I have been told by one of our leading

military experts that we cannot even successfully defend the Panama Canal against a heavy attack unless we can utilize the areas of Mexico and Central America in its defense.

Mr. President, I am not going to discuss this question at any length, but I should consider myself neglectful if I did not make one statement which I hope will be carried to the four corners of this land. I have discussed the question of United States cooperation with the Government of Mexico in planning our mutual defense, and, Mr. President, I have heard certain statements made that have shocked me to the heart because of the lack of ethics and morality and enlightened wisdom involved in them. It is being said by some few of our citizens, "Yes; we agree that the United States would be in a much stronger position if it could cooperate with the people and the Government of Mexico in mutual defense, but we think that the only thing to be done is for us to make an actual conquest with our Army of the territories and lands of Mexico." This sentiment is so violative of the very noble ideal that we in America have been preaching as to shock the conscience of the American people. As a matter of fact, there have been columnists and there have been editors who in the past 2 or 3 weeks by implication have urged that very thing. I say that if we are driven to a violation of our own standards which we have been urging upon the world in the last few years, then, indeed, is democracy destroyed right here in the United States.

Mr. President, I desire to point out that if the United States ever should move into Mexico with arms, and make any assault, not only would all the people of Mexico be aflame against us but almost every citizen in South America would consider it a holy crusade to help wage a war against the Colossus of the North.

I pray that we shall all soon perceive the necessity of closer cooperation between all the nations of North America, and that by just, generous, and noble standards we shall help to weld Canada, the United States, and Mexico into an unbreakable union in which all shall combine in the mutual defense of the sovereignties of their governments and the territorial boundaries of their lands.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. KING. I regret to learn from the observations of the Senator from California that any American newspaperman or columnist or statesman or man in the humbler walks of life—and I think sometimes our statesmen are "in the humbler walks of life"—would express the view which has just been suggested by the able Senator, namely, that there was a possibility, or even a thought, of our Government invading Mexico. I confess that I have never heard such an idea expressed. I know a number of years ago, when Carranza and Villa were important factors in Mexico, when a good many Americans were driven out of Mexico, and their property, amounting to several hundred million dollars, was confiscated, there was considerable resentment in the United States, but I did not hear even then—and that was in 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, and 1922—any suggestion that the United States should invade the territory of Mexico.

I do not believe that the people of this great Republic have ever contemplated the invasion of Mexico. I think they would resent it with as much vigor as would the people of Mexico themselves. I think that, on the contrary, the American people, by and large, have sympathized with Mexico because she has had economic and political problems which have pressed very heavily upon her. The American people have sympathized with the peons; they have sympathized with the underprivileged; they have sympathized with the Indians who have been denied, as many believe—and I am making no statement of fact for myself—privileges which they ought to have received under a democratic form of government.

I recall—and the Senator will pardon me for intruding longer upon his time—having had the honor to be chairman of the subcommittee of the platform committee of the Democratic Convention which met in New York in 1924, and I wrote the plank with regard to our relations to an interest in

Latin America. After indicating that we must work in harmony with Latin America, that her problems were our problems, that we were together in this Western Hemisphere, and that whatever would make for their advancement would make for ours, I concluded the statement by saying, "God hath made us neighbors; let justice keep us friends."

I think that President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull have demonstrated over and over again their profound interest not only in Mexico but in all Latin America. They have looked, as I think most of the people of this Republic have looked, upon South America and Latin America as really a part of the Western Hemisphere, have considered that our interests are linked together, and that we should work together for the development of democratic institutions and for the preservation of the high ideals and religious sentiments which have animated the American peoples and have made such important contributions to the development of civilization throughout the world.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator for his contribution. The distinguished Senator has said, much better than I could say, what I would have liked to have said. I agree with him that the present Government of the United States, in its conduct with Latin America, has displayed enlightened wisdom and high national standards, and I am glad to say that there is today a closer and kinder relationship, I think, than there has been for many years between the Government of Mexico and the Government of the United States.

I desire also to clarify the reference I have made by saying that in discussions which I mentioned it was, of course, assumed that the world was going into confusion and chaos and that in Mexico and in the United States, as well as elsewhere, there would be the threat of revolutionary movements and "fifth columnists" and saboteurs and spies, and it was in connection with that contemplation that several of the persons with whom I have talked made the statement of aggression against Mexico which I suggested. If the Senator desires I can furnish him privately with the columns and editorials to which I adverted. I have no desire to display them publicly.

Mr. President, let me say that I have the very highest opinion of and admiration for the present Mexican Government. I have no doubt that they will meet the American Government more than half way in any just plan for mutual cooperation.

I do not desire to protract this discussion very much longer, but I do say that right now there are things that ought to be done looking to the development of closer relations between the nations of this continent that are not being done, and I should like at least the opportunity to express my own ideas, humble as they are, before some committee of the United States Senate if in this critical hour we should decide to adjourn.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have not heard the remarks of the Senator from California as a whole, but I came into the Chamber at the time he was discussing the possibility of a revolution across the line in Mexico.

Let me say to the Senator from California that I have been in Mexico on several occasions, and whenever I heard any talk there about a revolution it usually came from some representative of an industrial enterprise, not of Mexico, who was indulging in wishful thinking about a revolution.

There is not going to be any revolution as far as the Mexican people are concerned; and I feel quite confident that I know what I am talking about when I say that revolutions will not occur in Mexico any more, because Uncle Sam is not going to let anyone from this side start a revolution in Mexico.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator for his very valuable contribution. He speaks with a much better knowledge of the subject than I do, and I am thoroughly in accord with the tenor of his statement.

Mr. President, I take it that there is another duty which the Congress of the United States should immediately undertake, and that is to restore all of our people to employment and all of our factories and resources to immediate

work. I dogmatically make the statement that if the Congress of the United States and the Chief Executive do not in the immediate present concentrate upon some plan of bringing about full employment in the United States within 1 year, we shall, indeed, be derelict in our duties.

In connection with the statement I made about Mexico, I should like to say to the Senator from New Mexico that I apprehend that if and when Hitler wins this war, the dictatorial governments will proceed to a tremendous industrial renaissance, and if that is not equaled in the Western Hemisphere we shall see right here in our own land, as well as in Mexico and South America, tremendous waves of disorder, discontent, and perhaps of revolution. Senators here are vastly disturbed about "fifth column" movements. Let me tell you that there is one very simple way to cut off the head of that horrid monster—a terribly destructive monster it may become—and that is the full employment of our people at just and adequate wages.

Do some Senators suggest that our present rearmament program is going to restore many of our people to employment? I say to you upon the advice of two of the ablest economists in two different bureaus of the Government that it is not going to do anything of the kind. It may not bring about any more employment than we have right now. One expert advised me that it might result in the employment of a million more men, and the other man said not to exceed 2,000,000; and we must remember, Mr. President, that hundreds of thousands of workers will be disemployed in our export industries in the next 6 months, and 2,400,000 young boys and girls will become 21 years of age. I say to you, Mr. President, that if we do nothing more than carry out the President's rearmament program, the unemployment in America will be just as great 1 year from now as it is today. Let me say further that when men begin to throw bouquets at Hitler because he is a conqueror of other nations, as later some may do, they are going to begin to compare our democracy and our economy with that produced by a dictatorship; and as much as I fear, dread, and hate a dictatorship I know there will be many jobless, frustrated, bitter, hungry men in the United States who will be inflammable material for the leadership of "fifth column" movements. Do not doubt it.

I listened the other day to the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], for whom I have the highest admiration, for his brilliant intellect and his incisive method of statement. I agree with him that if we go into this era much longer, pyramiding our debt as we are, the destruction of our national solvency, with all that means, will come upon us; but I disagree with him about the necessity of cutting expenses and raising taxes. I say that what we should do is to increase our productivity and our wealth; and I desire to place before some committee of the United States Senate, if I can only get the opportunity, the statements of bankers, industrialists, economists, experts, that we have one way by which every unemployed person could become employed within 1 year, performing a social service of great permanent value for us civilly, and performing a vital duty for our military defense, and that is through the construction of great superhighway systems in the United States.

Mr. President, we think we have done some things of note in building great public projects in the United States during the past few years. We have not done anything that is really big. I greatly admire the T. V. A. project and the work of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] in bringing it to fruition; but do you know that all of the T. V. A. units employed on an average less than 12,000 workers a year? We tell what a tremendous project that was in doing away with unemployment. It provided labor in actual construction to only 12,000 workers and perhaps to as many more in producing the materials that went into the various dams and other uses. We boast in the West because of our great projects, Bonneville and Grand Coulee, and our San Francisco bridges, and our Boulder Dam, and our Central Valley project in my State, near where I live. Why, Mr. President, not one of those projects employed as many as 5,000 men over a period generally of 4 or 5 or 6 years. We have in America millions upon millions of frustrated and bitter men asking the right to

work, denied the right to recreate here in America a great empire with noble highways that could double the mobility of our artillery and our military defense; and we have not even time to stay in session to listen to experts telling us how it can be done. The experts, I may say, are almost a unit on the accuracy of the statements I am making here.

Mr. President, consider for a moment: The cement plants of America are today operating at about one-half capacity. The sand and gravel plants are operating at less than half capacity. Everywhere in the United States, in every State, almost in every city, are gigantic monsters of metal and human ingenuity ready to tear this Nation apart to rebuild and bring beauty where there are now scars, and safety where there is now danger. Multitudes of powerful machines that could build us a thousand T. V. A.'s, or tens of thousands of miles of highways, are here right now, ready to go at the touch of millions of men who want to assist in operating those machines.

Mr. President, I have been talking to some of the greatest contractors in the United States. They say that around every cement plant, around every gravel plant, around every sand plant, around every projected highway are thousands upon thousands of men anxious and begging to do this work; and out of the colleges of America would come the engineers to oversee it, if we would but employ them in this great proposed highway project.

Mr. President, we have not only 10,000,000 unemployed workers in America; we have as many more part-time workers. We have tremendous idle manpower in this Nation that is ready to and wants to work.

Is it not our duty to remain in session until we have achieved the rational plan to end all idleness?

I am told by expert advisers that in every city and every State the blueprints are ready for some great highway project which would tend to make that city and that State more beautiful, a safer place in which to live, a wealthier city and State, and a better place for military defense. Within 90 days, if Congress would remain in session and see that it was done, we could be rebuilding the highways of America, employing our people, increasing the striking power of our military defense.

The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] must agree with me in at least one thing, that there is one very great city in the United States which certainly could stand a few superhighways over it, under it, and around it, and that is the city of Baltimore. [Laughter.] If I can but be given the opportunity, I will present before a Senate committee the most noted traffic experts, if Senators want to listen to them, who will tell them that the prime foundation of adequate military defense is wide, broad highways. I heard one of our foremost traffic experts state day before yesterday—I do not know that he is correct, and one distinguished Senator cast some doubt upon his statement, but he is a great expert—that there is not one road along the Atlantic seaboard which for any considerable distance can carry the heavy artillery of America. The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who knows much about the military, indicates that that is correct. One reason is that the bridges are not strong enough. I would feel apprehensive for Fredericksburg or Washington, D. C., if our military had to come from the other side of Baltimore at 75 miles an hour. There would not be very much of Baltimore left, or possibly of Fredericksburg or Washington, when our military forces arrived. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I am not suggesting that we employ 10,000,000 men in rebuilding the highways of America. I doubt whether there would be over four or five millions employed in that work, including the subsidiary and supporting industries. But their larger purchasing power would result in a better market for merchants and farmers and railways and barbers and every other class in America, and we could so regulate our highway building as to bring about full employment. As a matter of fact, we should start upon that program, and we should not stop it until every man in the United States who wanted it had a job, and every able-bodied man on relief who would not work was put off relief. We will

have no right, in the chaotic days which lie ahead of us, to burden our economy with relief-supported men who could be doing some constructive work for this Nation, and earning two or three times as much for their families as they now receive.

Mr. President, I desire to present but one more point, and then I will have concluded. The economists and the experts tell us that if we would regain full employment within the course of 2 or 3 years we could so increase the national income, and thereby the Federal receipts, at the present tax rates, that we could finance a military defense program of seven or eight or ten billion dollars a year without higher taxes or without borrowing. I believe that any Senator who would sit down and listen to the experts for a week would reach the certain and definite conclusion that we are the wealthiest empire of all times and places, that all we have to do is to run our farms, factories, stores, and railroads at full capacity to increase our national income within a year or 2 or 3 from 25 to 50 percent, and thereby increase our Federal taxes far more than that, because as we go into the higher tax brackets in income levies the tax receipts are increased out of proportion to the national income.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Maryland in his gloomy prophecies about what is going to happen to our solvency, our finances, and our business structures, in the way we are going, and I have no doubt that if he himself, with his brilliant intellect, would sit down around a table with the experts, he and they would reach some conclusion as to the way we must proceed if we are to restore this Nation to prosperity and our Government to solvency.

Mr. President, I dislike to say what I am about to say, but out in California we probably have 2,000,000 people frustrated, unhappy, miserable, their supporters seeking jobs and unable to get living wages. That group is almost to a man for the present administration because they are among the submerged and the unfortunate groups of our people. I have been at dinner with some of them where I have seen a lone piece of meat upon the table in my honor, and the children looking at it hungrily. Probably they had not had meat for months. I have been out in our jungles of our unfortunates and seen the children of the outcasts there, diseased, dirty, hungry, insufficiently clothed.

Almost every one of those people could and would be a loyal, patriotic American. But let this economy continue to function, with them as its victims for a few years longer, let them see their living standards further reduced by higher taxes and higher prices, and, knowing California, I say that they will be rich material for "fifth columns" and revolutionary activities which all the Army of the United States and all the agents of the F. B. I. and the Department of Justice will never be able to check.

We need have no fear of "fifth column" movements if our people are prosperous. There will be psychopaths, there will be Communists and bund leaders preaching disloyalty and treason, but our intelligence service can deal with them. It cannot deal with millions upon millions of frustrated, hungry, and unhappy people. Yes, general employment is the answer to our military defense, our "fifth column" activities, the financial difficulties of this Nation. I pray and hope that the Senators of the United States, who are of the highest ability and intelligence and devotion to duty, may undertake this problem with a sacred concentration upon their duties.

Mr. President, in the last few weeks there have been some words which seemed to me rather hysterical, from people in high offices here in the Senate and elsewhere, describing the terrible condition in which we would be if Hitler won the war. Those words seemed to me to be words of defeatism and despair. Here we are, a land of tremendous population, great wealth, resources, and technical skill. I declare that marshalling our people and our resources we can stand against all the world and hold the torch of democracy high and safe against every effort to dim its light. When leaders in high places again preach despair and defeatism, when they speak of our enslavement because the empires of France and Great Britain may crumble, I hope our citizens will go back to colonial days for inspiration, when a few million

people, inhabiting a continent in which three great powers struggled for mastery, had the courage to enunciate this American dream of freedom and democracy, and in a world where tyranny everywhere prevailed, strike out against the greatest empire of the time.

Yes, Mr. President, there were leaders in those days who in a world of absolutism, though representing a weak and numerically small people, dared to preach the redemption of mankind, and to strike the blows against oppression and to emerge free. If we of the United States, now with 130,000,000 people, cannot hold our freedom and democracy, our national existence and independence, then we are no longer worthy of the heritage of democracy and freedom. And we shall lose them. But only despair anticipates that loss. The courage and hope of America will proclaim, and, if necessary, fight to preserve and glorify the American way of life. I am sure we shall come through this crisis safely and bravely to a yet greater destiny.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment, which is pending and lying on the desk. Before calling up the amendment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment? I was out of the Senate Chamber when the Senator from California made a statement to which I wish to reply.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, does not the Senator from South Carolina wish that the absence of a quorum may be suggested in order that more Senators may be present when he makes his statement?

Mr. BYRNES. I do not wish to cause delay. The statement I wish to make will take only a few minutes.

I wish to refer to the statement made by the Senator from California because I have been asked the question as to the barter arrangement for the exchange of cotton for critical materials. In May 1939, when the Senate was considering a bill providing for the purchase of critical materials for \$100,000,000, the purchases to be spread over 4 years, it is a fact that, based upon a statement of the Navy Department to the Appropriations Committee, \$5,000,000 was sufficient for the needs of the Navy for that fiscal year and an estimate for only \$500,000 for the next year. I moved to amend to make the amount \$40,000,000 instead of \$100,000,000. Under that amendment, \$10,000,000 would have been spent each year. But the bill was not passed in that form. While the Senate agreed to that amendment, when the bill went to the House, \$100,000,000 was inserted, and the bill went to conference.

Before the bill was returned from conference, as the result of an investigation I reached the conclusion that the amount of \$100,000,000 should not be reduced but should be agreed to, and, in addition, that we should use some of the surplus cotton owned by the United States Government to secure additional supplies of rubber and tin. With the Secretary of Agriculture, I submitted the proposal to the State Department. The Secretary of State succeeded in negotiating a treaty between the Government of Great Britain and the Government of the United States for the exchange of cotton which we held in warehouses for tin and rubber. Under that agreement, up to this date we have received approximately 20,000 tons of rubber; there are approximately 15,000 tons ready for delivery, and the remainder of the 80,000 tons we were to secure has actually been purchased by the representatives of the British Government. Because they did not possess the rubber, they had to go out and purchase it. We own the cotton. Under our agreement, we asked the British not to purchase the rubber all at one time, because it would affect the market price of rubber in the United States. But that rubber has been purchased for delivery in the very near future. Some will be shipped next week, some the following week. Our State Department is endeavoring to facilitate these shipments.

One reason why a larger amount has not been secured to date is that our own people insisted that the British ships available should be used to carry the cotton owned by individuals and shipped by exporters, instead of cotton owned by

the Government, which was to be exchanged for rubber. But that, I believe, is being worked out, and the deliveries will be facilitated so that the remainder of the 80,000 tons can be secured at an early date.

In addition to that I may say that under the \$100,000,000 authorization, which was agreed to when the conference report was submitted to the Senate, \$22,500,000 has been appropriated by this Congress within the year, to be applied on this \$100,000,000 authorization. Pending in the Senate at this time is another bill making an appropriation of \$47,000,000 for the purchase of critical materials. That will make the appropriation in 1 year of \$80,000,000 instead of the appropriation of \$25,000,000, which was authorized by the Congress for its program of 4 years.

I must say that I share the views in a great measure of the Senator from California as to the importance of the subject. I am not one of those who will say that 1 year ago, or 6 months ago, or 3 months ago, I knew what was going to happen in Europe. I did not. But after my investigation of the critical-materials subject, I became convinced of its importance, not only from the standpoint of defense, but from the standpoint of industry, should we ever have trouble.

I know that the Senate will hear shortly from the Senator from New York, who has charge of a bill he is anxious to have considered by the Senate, and under which undoubtedly other purchases of critical materials will be made.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to express the opinion that the barter deal largely worked out by the Senator from South Carolina was a most advantageous and sound measure, and he and the others who participated in it deserve the congratulations of the country. I have no desire to minimize that. It was a very wise and a very helpful transaction. But that we may keep our perspective in this matter, let us recall that we use over one-half the rubber produced in the world. Our economy is largely dependent on rubber. As a matter of fact we consume more than 700,000 tons a year. Those 85,000 tons therefore that we were to receive were about 12 percent of what we consume in 1 year. Likewise do not forget that only about one-quarter of that is now in the United States.

Mr. BYRNES. When the Senator from California says "we consume," he means not the Government, but that industry consumes that amount.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES. Of the 80,000 tons included in the barter the Government now has 20,000 tons in this country today, 15,000 ready for delivery. The remainder has been purchased, and the reason it is not being delivered is because of the failure of this Government to ship the cotton which we owe the British on the trade. The \$80,000,000 will make a substantial addition for the needs of the Army and Navy. We are not making purchases for private industries.

SENTIMENT AGAINST PARTICIPATION IN EUROPEAN WAR

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, much has been said with reference to telegrams which Members of Congress have been receiving urging that the United States take an active part in the war. I wish to call attention to some telegrams which came to me this morning from all parts of the country after I spoke yesterday.

The first telegram reads:

You are quite right in checking the direction our Nation is heading. Congratulations on your stand of yesterday.

THE NORWOOD ENTERPRISE,
(For 46 years a Democratic newspaper.)

Here is a telegram from New York:

Your statement today opposing American entrance into the European war voiced the sentiments of the inarticulate masses of our country who are almost unanimously against sacrificing their sons on European battlefields. Would you be willing to address a great antiwar rally in Madison Square Garden if I can arrange it within the next week or 10 days?

WILLIAM GRIFFIN,
Editor and Publisher, New York Enquirer.

Here is one from Jane Martin, a member of the New York State Democratic Committee:

Congratulations on your speech today. Glad to see that one liberal has not turned his coat.

Here is one from Louis B. Ward, of Pontiac, Mich. He was a candidate for the Democratic nomination for Senator and was defeated by a comparatively few votes: He says:

Heartiest congratulations your Senate speech today.

Here is one from St. Louis:

We feel that all mothers, as well as an overwhelming majority of clear-thinking Americans, agree with you, which is not involvement in the European war. Continue the good work, which we hope will stop the hysteria in this country.

A. D. NIEDRINGHAUS,
M. WILLIAMS.

Here is one from Ann Arbor, Mich.:

On behalf of American youth we command your stand against war.

CHESTER BEAMAN,
JEROME BURDICK,
EDWIN HUMPHREY,
Students, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Here is one from Las Cruces, N. Mex.:

Your pronouncement against war hailed by many here. Wild hysteria ill becomes anybody and our Senate should rise above any such.

Dr. B. B. McGEE.

There are two telegrams from Albuquerque, N. Mex.; one from Rev. Edward F. Angluin, of Manchester, N. Mex.; and one from New Orleans.

Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have these telegrams printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a letter signed by 40 or 50 women members of the State Junior Department, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Montana Division. I call attention to the fact that these telegrams all came in this morning, or were sent last night, after my statement on the floor of the Senate yesterday. In addition, I have received at least 1,500 or 2,000 letters commending the speech which I made the other night against our involvement in war. Those letters run at least 4 to 1 in approval of my speech. With respect to the telegrams which came in this morning, there were 6 telegrams opposing my stand, while there were a great number favorable to it, which I hold in my hand. I ask unanimous consent that the telegrams and the letter to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., June 13, 1940.

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The British Empire has a population of 495,000,000. Why cannot it draft men from all its colonies and send them to France instead of expecting us to do so? Since we are sending them aircraft and munitions, the least they can do is to supply the fighters. We got nothing out of the Versailles Treaty. They got enough to arouse the enmity of Germany and Italy, the primary cause of the present war. Let them settle it themselves.

Mrs. S. W. BROWN.

MANCHESTER, N. H., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON WHEELER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your speech; keep up fight against war-mongers.

Rev. EDWARD F. ANGLUIN.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., June 13, 1940.

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations your speech to keep Nation out war. Your stand on issue excellent and should have support of every American. Great many New Mexicans with you.

ROBERT POAGE.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., June 13, 1940.

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Your speech on war fine. You have my best wishes for success in your stand. Could we obtain copies your speech?

E. L. COOMBS.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 12, 1940.

BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senator from Montana, Washington, D. C.:
 American mothers and fathers wish you Godspeed in your battle
 to save American youth from slaughter on foreign battlefields.
 HENRY O. NICKEL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 13, 1940.

Senator B. K. WHEELER:
 MY DEAR SENATOR: Twenty million honest, hard-working, intelligent, thoughtful men and women, the backbone of the country, are with you, and when this senseless and criminal European conflict is settled your friends who stand for world peace will declare themselves in no uncertain terms against the master politician who has brought about the uncalled-for hysteria now prevailing.
 Sincerely yours,

W. C. DURANT.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, June 13, 1940.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER:
 Permit me to commend you very highly for your statement opposing any candidate who is likely to get us into a war. Hope you will push this conviction and get others to do so. It is our only hope.

R. E. HOWE,
President, Appalachian Coals, Inc.

DETROIT, MICH., June 13, 1940.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER:
 Wish to congratulate you on stand against being pushed into war. The subterfuge used by the Government to sell war materials to Allies fits well with the policy of misleading by including war materials on order as available for defense, making inflammable speeches, and endorsing propaganda advertisements. We need more statesmen and fewer politicians.

R. B. RENFREW.

BELOIT, WIS., June 13, 1940.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
 Your warning in Senate yesterday meets this section's full approval. The hysterics of the East are not here in the West. We perhaps deal in sounder things and are stirred by facts and not emotions. To break party ties is difficult, but we must look to you for your usual courage and wisdom to bring organized party opposition to combat present apparent desire to build war party and by speeches, actions, and inferences bring a declaration of war upon us which may not be of our choosing.
 YATES AMERICAN MACHINE CO.,
 ALVIN HAAS, Vice President.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate:
 God bless you, great man of this hour, for opposing Roosevelt's war.

Rev. ZED H. COPP.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
 Congratulations. Stop war hysteria now. Radio your stand to the American people at once.

GEORGE W. MERKLE.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., June 12, 1940.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
Senate Office Building:
 Congratulations. God bless you for your courage. You will go down in history while others go down into oblivion.

BILL GOODWIN.

BUFFALO, N. Y., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
 Heartiest congratulations on your splendid Americanism. Would to God we had more Senators like you to check the President in his insidious efforts to lead us into war. Inarticulate millions in this country are with you and Senator HOLT in your patriotic and outspoken defense of our proclaimed neutrality. Strength to your arm to save the flower of our youth from this terrible holocaust.

Rev. L. F. SHARKEY.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
 Before you vote, expose scheme voting defense billion while allowing Allies strip us clean. "Fifth column," centering White House, determine to engulf us.

Mrs. C. C. MORRISON.

MARION, OHIO, June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
 As an average American citizen with one son of Army age, I cannot endorse your speech of yesterday too strongly. Keep us out of war.
 D. R. BIGGERT.

WINNETKA, ILL., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER:
 Heartily in sympathy with your fight, as all my friends are. Keep it up.

FRANK F. FERRY.

WINNETKA, ILL., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
The Senate:
 Continue your good fight for nonintervention. Thousands are backing you.

JEANNETTE WELLS.

WINNETKA, ILL., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER:
 We agree absolutely with the stand you are taking. Keep up the good fight. We are behind you.

DEBORAH S. FERRY.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 13, 1940.

Senator WHEELER:
 Have just sent telegram to our President saying, give me a government of Americans by Americans and for Americans, or give me death.

MAURICE FIORITO.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER:
 Thanks for your stand against war. Keep up good work.

Mrs. LAURA BROSENE.

PATTERSON, N. J., June 13, 1940.

Senator WHEELER, of Montana,
Senate Chamber:
 For God's sake carry on. America depends upon men like you.
 Mr. and Mrs. L. SPIZZIRI.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON WHEELER:
 Congratulations on your stand. Hope you will not be dissuaded from it later on.

Mrs. PEYTON KNIGHT.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 13, 1940.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER:
 Applaud your stand yesterday. Hope you will continue opposing interventionists.

WILLIAM M. TRUMBULL,
Highland Park, Ill.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 13, 1940.

BURTON K. WHEELER:
 May I express my sincere admiration for the stand you are taking against the obvious efforts to get this country in war. Your courage at this time is an inspiration to all true Americans.
 CORINNE GRIFFITH MARSHALL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 12, 1940.

BURTON K. WHEELER,
Senate Office Building:
 You are a great American, and there are not many of them.
 COURTLAND SMITH.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., June 12, 1940.

BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
 Thank God in Heaven, we have men left like you. Keep our beautiful country out of war.

AN AMERICAN MOTHER
 (Mrs. Mauch).

SAYBROOK, CONN., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON WHEELER, of Montana:
 Can't you hear us cheering? The crowd is with you.
 Mr. and Mrs. JOHN M. FINNEY.

MILES CITY, MONT., June 13, 1940.

Senator B. K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
 Congratulations on your stand regarding war. You will find much support among sober-thinking people.
 R. R. RANDAL, M. D.

Senator WHEELER,
MILLBURN, N. J., June 13, 1940.

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Senator, we agree wholeheartedly with your feelings regarding the international situation and are pleased to see you have courage to fight for your own conviction. Would that we had a Senator like you from New Jersey. May we express our appreciation and admiration to real man. Keep up the fight.

HENRY and RUTH BECKER,
Republicans.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
I heartily endorse your stand against sending our sons to foreign battlefields. Keep up the fight.

Mr. and Mrs. B. W. REUBEN.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Your great speech this afternoon against our country being drawn into war is deeply appreciated by the undersigned.

JOHN E. TREVOR.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your courageous stand against war. I hope other leaders of your party will have the courage to take the same attitude.

J. P. LINS.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 12, 1940.

Senator B. K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
Sincerest congratulations, deepest support for your antijingoist speech of Wednesday.

NORMAN W. HAY.

BATON ROUGE, LA., June 13, 1940.

Senator WHEELER of Montana,
Capitol Building, Washington, D. C.:
Thanks for keeping alive the Washingtonian doctrine of no European entanglements. Have wired my Senators and Representatives to keep us out of war. Remember 1917-18.

J. ANDREW BALLINGER.

ST. LOUIS, MO., June 12, 1940.

Senator WHEELER, of Montana,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand taken in Senate today. Voices opinion of a majority of Americans. Suggest Congress start a stop-Roosevelt movement as a safety measure to United States of America.

FLORENCE and JOHN R. JACKSON.

PASADENA, CALIF., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:
Urge your powerful influence to keep America from European war. Congress should remain in session indefinitely to protect us. Work to defeat un-American Pepper bill.

Mrs. W. K. JEWETT.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., June 12, 1940.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Fight to keep our boys at home. England has her Army scattered everywhere and millions to draw from. Let her call them in to help France. I can conceive of no greater tragedy than to send our boys to die or be maimed for life on foreign soil. Our duty is to our own Nation and only our own. We want no foreign entanglements.

F. W. SINCLAIR.

DALLAS, TEX., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
We have heard all your public utterances and statements, all of which deal in realities and patriotic motives. Certainly the country will support you. Congratulations on your stand which will avoid any war abroad for this country.

Mr. and Mrs. HARRY J. RENKEN.

KANSAS CITY, MO., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your stand taken today to keep us out of war. Thousands of old-time Democrats are with you. Don't weaken on your position.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN MAYER.

BERKELEY, CALIF., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your courage and clear vision in such times. The hope and faith of many true Americans still back your stirring fight for sanity.

HARRY E. STUARD.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
We and millions of Americans support your stand against war wholeheartedly and are looking to you for leadership in antiwar campaign. What can we do to help suggest you call for contributions for newspaper space and radio time? We would contribute. Congress should formally disavow administration's war provocations.

Mr. and Mrs. WILLIAM HELFER.

CULVER CITY, CALIF., June 13, 1940.

Senator WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
It is refreshing to learn that we common people still have representatives with their feet on the ground. Most of those with whom I associate believe we should stay out of war. Congratulations on your speech in the Senate today.

JAS. A. BROCK.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your speech today. Every American appreciates your efforts to keep us out of war.

A. W. MILLS.

DAYTON, OHIO, June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
Congratulations on your speech in the Senate.

DON SHARKEY.

WICHITA FALLS, TEX., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Thank you for your courage in voicing the prayers of millions of troubled hearts.

EARL VANDALE.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
We commend your stand against any involvement in European war and are with you wholeheartedly in opposing any war-minded Presidential candidate. We join you in condemning the President's unneutral dictatorial utterances. Please inform Senators HOLT, NORRIS, LA FOLLETTE, LUNDEEN, NYE, CLARK, JOHNSON, and DOWNEY we appreciate their antiwar stand.

BEVIER ROBINSON,
President, Olson Democratic League.
FRANK G. MAKEPEACE,
President, Democratic Union, Eighteenth Congressional District.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER:
My congratulations. Keep up the good work. Regards.

T. T. HARKRADER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 13, 1940.

Senator WHEELER,
Senate Office Building:
Congratulations. Keep up fight against war party.

Mrs. P. SALZBERG.

ELIZABETH, N. J., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER:
Heartily approve your stand on war mongering. Keep us out.

K. M. SIEG.

STOCKTON, CALIF., June 13, 1940.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
As a loyal American citizen affiliated with the Democratic Party I, like the majority of our plain American citizens, although many of them do not or cannot express themselves as to our foreign affairs but who have to do the suffering and fighting for a certain clique of war mongers, profiteers, and tax-exempted coupon clippers, wish to thank you for your real American and courageous stand in the Senate of today. America first and all the time. Let Europe fight their own selfish wars. You for our next President.

FRED W. JUNKER.

BERKELEY, CALIF., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
 Congratulations on stand for true Americanism. We in the West are still thinking normally and of America first.

Mr. and Mrs. W. B. HIRST.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
 Your courageous and intelligent speech stamps you as the kind of man we need for President.

GEORGE ENZINGER.

SEATTLE, WASH., June 13, 1940.

Senator WHEELER,
United States Senator (Montana), Washington, D. C.:
 Interviewed thousand individuals throughout 38 States; convinced numerous Democrats awaiting leader against military rule and foreign propaganda; offer services you and bolt.

M. WANNAMAKER.

HANOVER, N. H., June 13, 1940.

Senator WHEELER:
 Congratulations on your peace stand; opponents to Roosevelt foreign policy are not being heard in the press. Neither are many college professors, who vigorously oppose warlike policy. When England wants to change policy and save face she changes premier. I earlier favored third term for Roosevelt, but now urge another Democratic progressive who can switch policy.

L. J. SALTER.

SEATTLE, WASH., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
 Deep appreciation for your common sense and courage.

FRED SHORTER,
Judge of the People, Seattle.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
 We, the National Legion of Mothers of America, heard your stand of today, and we want to thank you. Please accept our gratitude and approval.

NATIONAL LEGION OF MOTHERS OF AMERICA,
 CROSSROADS OF THE WORLD.

BUTTE, MONT., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
 Congratulations on your stand against war. Ninety percent of the people are with you praying that you consolidate the opposition against warmongers, including the man in the White House, to stop repeal of Johnson Act and other war hysteria. Your fight makes you the next President of the United States.

MARK J. DOEPKER.

BUTTE, MONT., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
 I am 100 percent in agreement with you on your recent stand in the war situation which is the opinion of 90 percent of the American people. Congratulations.

A. E. ANDERSON.

SAN MARINO, CALIF., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
 Your statement in the Senate today that you would break with war party gave us new hope as war frenzy grows. More power to you.

Mr. and Mrs. HERBERT BRAGG.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, June 12, 1940.

Senator BURT K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
 Permit me to congratulate you on your sane, patriotic, truly American stand on involvement in the European war.

A. B. LARSON.

ST. LOUIS, MO., June 13, 1940.

BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:
 Our national defense is so weak then why in the name of God does our President insist on giving away what little equipment we have. Adjournment should be delayed. No additional powers should be given President. May God give you and your colleagues strength to see that America remains out of any European war.

CHARLES J. BAKER.

NORTH HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
 Thanks for your attitude toward not sending American boys to Europe. All our friends feel same way. We are strong for national defense and material help over there but want to keep our boys at home.

GALE H. EAST.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., June 12, 1940.

Senator B. K. WHEELER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
 All mothers are behind you 100 percent. I don't want my boy to be cannon fodder. Millions of unorganized Americans agree with your program. Senator, keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

Mrs. BECK.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., June 12, 1940.

United States Senator WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
 Congratulations. Hoist your flag and form a new party. Real Americans are sick of Hopkins, Perkins, Roosevelt, Hoover, and Landon. For God's sake, give us a break against the New Deal British agents. Never quit. Millions will back you. Publish this if you can use it.

LLOYD A. TEITSWORTH,
Engineer, United States Navy.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., June 12, 1940.

BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. D.:
 Congratulations on your stand against intervention. Keep it up, no matter how high the war hysteria rises. We cannot afford another fifty billions to play power politics in Europe.

W. BABCOCK CROWELL.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., June 12, 1940.

Senator WHEELER,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
 From the real veterans of the Three Hundred and Eighth Infantry, keep up the good work. We don't want a dictatorship in this country. The veterans are behind you.

A. M. BONNER.

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 13, 1940.

Senator WHEELER OF MONTANA,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
 Your sentiments about breaking with the war party certainly hits the bull's-eye. On the outside it looks as if Washington is full of hotheads running off at the mouth. Their wild talk does no good now, while it makes wise efficiency in charting our best course extremely difficult.

C. D. KIMBALL.

MEADVILLE, PA., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
 As Americans of early settler stock, we wish to thank you for your courageous stand for the true welfare of our country.

CHARLOTTE and WALTER KIDDER.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, June 12, 1940.

Senator WHEELER OF MONTANA,
Washington, D. C.:
 I admire your courage and agree with you 100 percent. If your colleagues would ignore the press and radio reports and ask the man in the street, they would surprise themselves. I come in contact with hundreds of loyal American citizens daily, and know that they are against us entering into the second World War or to do anything which might get us into this war. We talk about the Monroe Doctrine. Why not let Europe take care of their own affairs? America for Americans. Europe for Europeans.

Respectfully,

JOHN H. KOHSTALL.

PITTSBURGH, PA., June 12, 1940.

Senator WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:
 Keep us out of war.

E. L. STEVENS.
 H. M. RYS.
 L. V. RYS.
 MARY STEVENSON.

WHITEHALL, N. Y., June 12, 1940.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:
 Congratulations. Spoken like a true American. We don't want war.

Lt. STEVE VINCIGUERRA.

LOCUST VALLEY, N. Y., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your stand. This country should not be thrown into war through a camouflage of political expediency or hysteria. Would like to know whether State Department took all necessary precautions to notify belligerents regarding passage of S. S. Washington in European waters.

NELSON SLATER.

LONG ISLAND CITY, N. Y., June 12, 1940.

Senator WHEELER,

Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your courageous stand to keep us out of European war.

Mr. and Mrs. C. F. SCHERZINGER.

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your excellent fight. Keep America out of war.

HARRY A. SULLIVAN.

BAYSIDE, N. Y., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON WHEELER,

Washington, D. C.:

You have today rendered the greatest service to our country and mankind. May God bless you and yours.

ROBERT HARRISS.

CULVER CITY, CALIF., June 12, 1940.

BURTON K. WHEELER,

Senator from Montana, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations. Am in full accord of your speech of today.

RUSSELL THOMAS.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO, June 12, 1940.

HON. BURTON K. WHEELER,

The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Grateful for your stand on war. Think you truly trying to save the American people and our democracy. Wish poll of American leaders advocating our entry into war could show Nation whether war advocates will enlist for active service overseas.

BEATRICE ROSSELL.

442 HOPKINSON AVENUE,
BROOKLYN, N. Y., June 12, 1940.

Senator WHEELER,

Washington, D. C.:

Millions of Americans support your courageous leadership in keeping America at peace. Roosevelt following Wilsonian pattern that plunged us into war. Extend no loans. American boys should defend American—not manure European—battlefields with their young bodies.

LYDIA GOLDMAN.

16747 PLAINVIEW,
DETROIT, MICH., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,

Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Fully endorse your stand in neutrality to keep America out of the war. Wish you success in your fight.

JOHN RUMPEL.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 12, 1940.

The Honorable BURTON K. WHEELER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations for your splendid stand against war as expressed by you today in the Senate. I have traveled extensively during the past several months throughout the Middle West and South and know that the people of this country await leadership to keep this country out of war. If you take a forceful stand against our becoming involved in a war the issues of which do not concern the American people, you will be nominated by the Democratic Party and elected President of the United States. Countless young men today are making the statement that they would refuse to go to war in Europe. As an American citizen I feel deeply appreciative of your timely and forceful statement. My highest considerations.

J. EDWARD JONES.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,

The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations to an American. The majority of the people are against war.

WILLIAM E. HARDTKE.
WILLIAM P. KUNDE.
WALTER P. KUNDE.
JOHN H. LENZ.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,

Washington, D. C.:

You are an American; you have the guts statesmen are made of—not politicians. I wish to congratulate you on your stand with reference to our Nation's welfare and also to your backbone in defying an all-powerful administration.

WILLIAM H. CLARKE.

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF., June 13, 1940.

Senator WHEELER, of Montana,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your antiwar stand today. Some member Democratic Party must have strength to stop administration's apparent attempt to lead us into this war. Country is more important than party. Let's build our own defense to maximum.

R. H. THOMPSON.

OAKLAND, CALIF., June 13, 1940.

United States Senator WHEELER,

Washington, D. C.:

American people were thinking entire Congress elected from England. Thank God for those like you who represent America.

Mr. and Mrs. F. B. JONES.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON WHEELER,

Washington, D. C.:

Thank God the United States still has in its official ranks men of your caliber who are not afraid either of official condemnation or of constituent criticism to state the facts and expose the propaganda that seems determined to draw us, the people, into a foreign war.

Dr. W. L. WEBER,
(And family.)

WAUWATOSA, WIS., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Thank God Senators WHEELER and HOLT have spoken. Your leadership Court packing went far to preserve American democracy. We sympathize with Allies but want no war. Want American institutions preserved for our children. Millions with you. Keep up the fight. We are private citizens, no personal axes to grind.

Mr. and Mrs. E. O. MILLER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Warmest congratulations on your determined stand against involvement from one who is ripe for the fray. May good luck and success attend your patriotic efforts.

H. G. P. DEANS.

OMAHA, NEBR., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Hearty congratulations on your fight against sending Army, Navy supplies to foreign nations. America must avoid being dragged into Europe's war.

ROGER WEEKS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON WHEELER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Approve your declaration to break with the Democratic Party. It is becoming a war party. Wilson was elected on a false promise to keep us out of war. Roosevelt's statements that he hates war seem to be only a hollow gesture. America wants Congress to keep us out.

R. S. PADGET.

WEST LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana,

Washington, D. C.:

People here back your stand. Prepare defense. Prevent the administration plunging United States into Europe's commercial war.

MAURICE GERAGHTY.

BUTTE, MONT., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,

Washington, D. C.:

One hundred percent with you on your war-party declaration. Overwhelming majority of American women pray that your fight against war will bring back sanity to the Senate and House, who appear stampeded by war mongers and propaganda. Stop the stripping of our defense materials to bolster international dead-beats. One experience should be enough. We pray that you are the next President of the United States.

MARY HENNESSY.

TOPEKA, KANS., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Your stand courageous and patriotic. Don't give up. Too much hypocrisy has been shown in high places. Defense, yes; participation, never. The Nation will thank you forever. Good old American guts are needed now, if ever. See CLYDE REED and CAPPER. To your success.

A. J. BRIER, M. D.

DUBUQUE, IOWA, June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:

God bless you and Senator HOLT for your patriotism and courage. America is behind you and condemns hysterical attitude of the President and Senator PEPPER.

GEO. H. MOST.

BOSTON, MASS., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations; your's great antiwar speech. Peace sentiment of country is such that you can be elected President easily by more of same.

C. R. OWNES.
BERNARD FREEMAN.
ROBERT WOODRUFF.
CHARLES WHIPPLE.
GEORGE MARKHAM.
T. J. COLLINS.

BATON ROUGE, LA., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Hurray for BURTON WHEELER fearlessly putting American interests ahead of all foreign pressure. More power to you, Hop. An old supporter of 1924. Regards.

JOHN H. BERNHARD,
634 Common Street, New Orleans.

ST. PETERSBURG, FLA., June 13, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:

God and Senator WHEELER make a majority. You are under the right banner. Long may you wave it. Gratitude and encouragement to you.

ANN PORTER.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations your courageous warning in threat to bolt party if it becomes war party, which seems inevitable transition if current administration-inspired hysteria unchecked.

JOE HOWARD.

COLUMBIA, S. C., June 12, 1940.

Senator BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Yours is the voice of courage and reason in these days of fostered fears and inspired passions. Our only chance for peace lies in the hope that you and a few others who have the courage to be sane will, before the zealots crucify you in the name of democracy and patriotism, make the Senate see these things: First, that its allegiance is to this Nation and not to any foreign power, no matter how sympathetic it may be to that nation's cause, and second, that the trust it holds is to protect the people even against the peoples' madness.

JAMES F. DREHER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 13, 1940.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:

The New York County Committee of the American Labor Party welcomes your stand against the drive to put America into war. We are sure that you speak for the overwhelming majority of the American people who have consistently voiced their opposition to the involving of this country in the European conflict.

EUGENE P. CONNOLLY,

Chairman, New York County Committee American Labor Party.

BUTTE, MONT., June 12, 1940.

Senator WHEELER,
Washington, D. C.:

Your "Montana salon" of keeping out of war is endorsed by every parent-loving man and woman in America who loves their boys. I am standing with you in their behalf.

CLIFTON A. FARON,
Kansas City, Mo., and Butte, Mont.

STATE JUNIOR DEPARTMENT,
FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
Great Falls, Mont., June 8, 1940.

Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the mothers of the soldiers who must fight in the world war if the United States should enter the conflict, beg and implore that you honestly, earnestly, and at all cost refuse your assent to any direct or indirect move that will cause the death of those to whom we gave life and for whom we would die.

We believe that other mothers in other nations, human like ourselves, have the same feeling. We can be enemies only if we are ignorant of each other—ignorant especially of our economic problems. We believe the problems of our potential enemies are the problems with which we ourselves are struggling.

We are firmly convinced that war will not solve but rather complicate these problems by adding fear, suspicion, and hatred to our already real miseries. We petition you, therefore, to seek to avoid war where the avoidance can alone be possible—in the respect of human rights; in the recognition that all men, not only Americans, have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We wish that to all the peoples of the earth. We wish and we demand that for ourselves and for every potential enemy of any state and on both sides of the present European struggle.

We firmly believe the human family to be a family with God as our Father. We ask that you, in all your thinking, remember that we are God's children; that we are members of each other; that in that family Jew or Gentile does not matter. All that matters is that we are brothers in one bond.

As our representative you must not, you dare not, go beyond our will. If you hesitate in your mind as to what our will may be, recess the Congress and come to us and we will tell you.

We sincerely hope you will give heed to our petition.

Sincerely,

Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America,
Leaders Camp, Fort Assiniboine, Havre, Mont.; Harriet Stoner, Outlook, Mont.; Lulu Mills, Fairfield, Mont.; Clara Bruyer, Kalispell, Mont.; Hilda de Young, Froid, Mont.; Leora Johansen, Dagmar, Mont.; Edna Hostetler, Conrad, Mont.; Esther Adams, Peerless, Mont.; Ruth Kopp, Girard, Mont.; Alice Thomas, Wolf Point, Mont.; Ruby Rimmer, Havre, Mont.; Charlotte Holtz, Portage, Mont.; Verna A. Carlson, Oswego, Mont.; Lillian Nyquist, Homestead, Mont.; Anna L. Olsrud, Kalispell, Mont.; Verna Huidekoper, Bole, Mont.; Gordon Twedt, Rudyard, Mont.; Myrtle I. Blair, Sidney, Mont.; Dixie McBride, Havre, Mont.; Ernest Lapke, Madoc, Mont.; Mrs. Verna Gunderson, Sidney, Mont.; Harry H. Norton, Simms, Mont.; Mrs. Hans Offett, Scooby, Mont.; Mrs. Agnes Gregerson, Peerless, Mont.; Ila Standish, Bole, Mont.; George J. Kapk, Havre, Mont.; Mrs. Hans Offett, Peerless, Mont.; Mrs. Palmer M. Hanson, Scooby, Mont.; Genetha Elliott, Girard, Mont.; Mildred Ragland, Hardin, Mont.; Dora Johnson, Froid, Mont.; Esther Harbo, Froid, Mont.; Albert Hellebust, Havre, Mont.; Erling Peterson, Havre, Mont.; Loraine Schulz, Great Falls, Mont.; Mildred K. Stoltz, Valier, Mont.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7074) to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective departments.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8913) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 17 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 544) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahay	Lodge	Sheppard
Andrews	Downey	Lucas	Shipstead
Ashurst	Ellender	Lundeen	Slattery
Austin	George	McKellar	Smith
Bailey	Gerry	McNary	Stewart
Bankhead	Gillette	Maloney	Taft
Barkley	Green	Mead	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Guffey	Miller	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gurney	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Hale	Murray	Tobey
Brown	Harrison	Neely	Townsend
Bulow	Hatch	Norris	Truman
Burke	Hayden	Nye	Tydings
Byrnes	Herrington	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Capper	Hill	Overton	Van Nuys
Caraway	Holman	Pepper	Wagner
Chandler	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	White
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	Wiley
Connally	King	Russell	
Danaher	La Follette	Schwartz	
Davis	Lee	Schwellenbach	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment which I have offered, and which is now on the desk, be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 17, after the semicolon, it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used to defray the expenses of transferring or maintaining the existing officers and personnel embraced in subdivisions (1) and (a) and (b) of (2) at points other than in the cities and States where now located.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this amendment does not make any change in the amount of money carried in the joint resolution. It does not suggest that any item be transferred from one place to another. It relates wholly to the existing set-ups under the Treasury Department in the various States.

At the present time I am advised that every State has an accounting office under the Treasury Department. We have the procurement division, and likewise the disbursing division, already set up in the several States. These offices are being maintained in the States in connection with the relief work.

If the joint resolution is enacted as now written, without this limitation, I am advised that the State offices will be abandoned, and that regional offices will be set up to handle the work of two or more States.

At the present time we have a State office in my State of Oklahoma. We have employed there something like 100 persons handling the three activities, accounting, procurement, and disbursing. It is now planned practically to close the State offices and transfer the functions to regional offices. In the case of Oklahoma the agencies will be transferred to a proposed regional office located either in Texas or Missouri, and I understand the same thing is proposed for other States.

Mr. President, there are something like 5,000 employees in the various State set-ups. If the proposed program is carried out, 100 families in my city of Oklahoma City will be forced either to transfer to Texas or to Missouri or to lose their jobs. What happens to Oklahoma will happen to other States.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this is a poor time to propose such a violent readjustment of the relief agencies. My amendment has for its purpose providing that the State agencies shall be maintained where they now are at least until later in the year, or until we meet next January. I understand that if the proposed program goes through, the State offices now maintained in the State of Maryland will be consolidated with the offices in the District of Columbia. What happens to Maryland will happen to Oklahoma. What happens to Oklahoma will happen to Kansas, and to all the

States except those in which the regional offices are proposed to be established.

I understand that regional offices are proposed to be established in the cities where there are Federal Reserve banks. That means that 12 regional offices will be established in the 12 States having Federal Reserve banks; and the other States, some 30 of them, will lose the existing personnel.

Mr. President, as I said before, this is a poor time to propose such a radical readjustment of the present set-ups in the various States of the Nation. For example, in my State, as in most other States, there is a W. P. A. organization. We have a number of W. P. A. relief persons, which necessitates the making and writing of about 100,000 checks a month. At the present time the checks are prepared in the capital of my State, Oklahoma City. If the office there is abolished, and the work is transferred to some other State, then my State must send its list of checks to another State where the same work must be done, and then the checks, a hundred thousand of them each month, must be sent back to my State. I do not think the saving, if there would be any saving, would be at all commensurate with the disadvantage and inconvenience the State would be put to in the event the proposed transfer were made.

So, Mr. President, I submit the amendment. Its only effect would be to maintain the status quo in the several Federal set-ups in the States under the Treasury Department. That is the whole force of the amendment, and, at the proper time, I shall ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, if the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma should be adopted, the amount of money appropriated by the bill would not be adequate to carry on the functions of the Treasury Department which are devoted to W. P. A. accounting and bookkeeping. The practical effect of the provision of the bill is that in an effort to economize there has been a program of regionalization. I do not happen to know whether or not it would affect my State; I assume my State would be affected the same as would Oklahoma. The saving which would be effected would be \$1,200,000. It is merely a question as to whether or not we wish to spend an additional \$1,200,000 in order to maintain the employees who are now distributed in the various States. If the amendment should be adopted, there should be provided enough money to carry on the work. In other words, there has been a reduction of \$1,200,000 from the appropriation of last year for carrying on this work, and the Treasury Department feel that there will be an increase and not a decrease in efficiency.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator from Colorado in charge of the bill makes the statement that if this amendment should prevail, then the item should be increased in toto \$1,200,000?

Mr. ADAMS. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that if this amendment should prevail there are ample funds in these three items to maintain the present organizations at the present places until the meeting of Congress in January? Then, if we desire at that time, after further consideration, to concentrate and regionalize these offices, we can do so; but there will be no necessity for increasing these items now, as ample funds will be afforded to carry on until Congress meets again next winter.

Mr. ADAMS. That would be true if we disregarded the antideficiency law, which requires that money shall be apportioned over a 12-month period. If we desire to disregard the law, that can be done, but otherwise it cannot be done. This amount of money is appropriated for a 12-month period on a basis to make the saving I have suggested. I think the Senator should understand that, and I believe that, under conditions as they are, we ought to be willing to stand the removal of a few offices from our States. Only

some 500 employees would be affected throughout the United States. I suppose in a State such as my own, which represents, roughly, 1 percent of the population of the United States, five or six employees would be affected. In other States, I imagine, the State of Oklahoma, for instance, there would be perhaps twice that many.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It would affect a hundred in my State, 85 in Alabama, and other States in proportion to population. In populous States such as New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, with millions of people, it would probably involve several hundred, and in smaller States, of course, a smaller number would be involved, but the average would be about a hundred for each State.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator and I are differing in the use of the term affected. I mean there will be an economy by taking out from the service altogether some 500 employees. The Senator is thinking of those who would be transferred and who would still remain in the Government service.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If this amendment should prevail, no doubt there would be some employees who would lose their jobs.

Mr. ADAMS. About 500.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. They would go on some form of relief in all probability. That is the first point. The second point is that, if the action contemplated is taken those residing in Denver and in Baltimore who fill the present positions must close their homes and move to some other town in another State. If they do not do that, they lose their jobs and go on relief. So, as I see the picture, it is about 50-50. If we turn these people out, and they cannot find other jobs—and but few can now find other jobs—then they go on the other side of the equation, the relief side. Under present conditions, I think it is a bad time to make such a radical change in our relief set-up. Upon that basis I submit the amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Of course, the Senator and I draw opposite conclusions. It seems to me that this is just the time, when we are being driven to great expenditures for other purposes, to economize in the administrative agencies of the Government, when it can be done without sacrificing functions or efficiency in any way. So I have been inclined to feel that in my State I am willing to take what little consequences may come in order that we may make this very substantial saving without sacrificing efficiency.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am wondering if the Senator has made any investigation as to the question of efficiency and whether or not it would be sacrificed. We have had in New Mexico some rather unfortunate experiences in the transfer of State offices to regional offices. Some small saving may have been accomplished, but it has resulted in marked inefficiency in service to the people of my State.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator, perhaps, has in mind the Home Owners' Loan organization situation?

Mr. HATCH. That is exactly it.

Mr. ADAMS. I am entirely in accord with the Senator in reference to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation set-up. I think the regionalization of the Home Owners' Loan offices was improper, and I think it resulted in inefficiency. In that instance titles had to be examined and collections had to be made, which involved operations in the immediate locality.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Colorado has mentioned the very institution I have in mind. We were told at that time that the establishment of regional offices would work a great saving and work toward efficiency. Exactly the opposite has taken place in my State. I doubt whether there

has been any saving from the standpoint of economy; and I know that there has been no increase in efficiency; but, on the contrary, a great deal of inefficiency has resulted.

Mr. ADAMS. I accept the Senator's statement. In this instance I do not answer as to efficiency, but I know there is a saving in the bill, for there is a reduction of \$1,200,000 because of this proposed regionalization.

Mr. HATCH. I quite well understand what the Senator says, and I have been impressed with what he has said about the necessity, if the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma were adopted, for increasing the appropriation. I do not see how, under existing law, we can possibly carry on under the plan suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LUNDEEN obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The amendment pending provides for maintaining State offices under the Treasury Department. It is suggested by the Senator from Colorado that if this amendment should prevail it would thereafter be necessary to either increase the items in the sum of \$1,200,000 or else those items would be too small to maintain the offices in the States. That could be easily obviated, in the event my amendment should prevail, by offering three small amendments to increase these items in the total sum of \$1,200,000.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I concur thoroughly in what the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] has said with reference to the H. O. L. C. offices. As he has said, we were told that abolishing those offices, and regionalizing or merging them, would make for efficiency and economy. On the contrary, experience has shown that that was not true.

Now, we are confronted with exactly the same situation today that we were confronted with about the H. O. L. C. offices. We ought not to permit the abolition of these offices; we ought to vote for and support the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma, and assure the continuance of these offices.

If the Senator from Minnesota will yield for that purpose, I wish to indicate to the Senate the States where offices will be abolished. I read now from page 317 of the House hearings:

In region No. 1 State offices would be abolished in Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont.

These offices would be abolished and the people in those States, instead of being served as they are now being served, and as they have been served for the past 6 years, by their State offices, would have to petition or to take some other action to see if they could get some kind of service from the regional office in Boston, Mass.

In New York, region No. 2, there are two offices today. New York is one region unto itself, with an office at Albany, which is the capital of the State, and one in New York City. Under this proposal the office at Albany would be abolished, and persons would have to go to the great city of New York to see if they could get their problems attended to there.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the Senator allow me to make an inquiry?

Mr. HILL. I will be glad to do so if the Senator from Minnesota, who has the floor, will yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. The Senator makes the statement that people would have to go down to other cities. As a matter of fact, there is no occasion, except in the rarest instances, for people to go to the Treasury or the procurement division or the division of disbursements. It is a matter of mail service, and of mailing checks.

Mr. HILL. Oh, yes; I realize that any business may be transacted by mail; but there are times when, if it is desired to have a job done, it is necessary to go and attend to it in person. I realize that these checks perhaps will be sent through the mail.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, this matter has to do merely with the accounting system.

Mr. HILL. It has to do with purchasing supplies. That is what the procurement office is for. I realize that you can send a letter down here, and if you do, you will get the nicest little form letter, No. 1,579,000,000, the same letter that all these other 1,579,000,000 folks have received. The Senator knows that.

Now to go to Region No. 3, the offices will be abolished in the States of Delaware and New Jersey, and all the work concentrated in Philadelphia, Pa.

Region No. 4: The Kentucky office will be abolished, and everything concentrated at Cleveland, Ohio.

The next region—the offices in the State of Maryland, the State of North Carolina, the State of Virginia, and the State of West Virginia will be abolished, and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] must transact his business with the District of Columbia.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order that we may fix the responsibility for the nefarious crime which is about to be perpetrated on the State of Maryland, may I inquire whether this bill originated in the House of Representatives?

Mr. HILL. It is an appropriation measure, and originated in the House of Representatives; that is true. Let me say, however, that it lies within the power of the Senate of the United States to assert itself, here and now, to prevent this action from being taken. While the House of Representatives did it, we have equal responsibility with the House of Representatives. We are now confronted with the necessity of doing our part, meeting our responsibility, and stopping this action.

The next region: Offices will be abolished in Alabama, Florida, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama is not disturbed about the abolition of the Alabama office; is he? [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Yes; I am disturbed, because I want the people of Alabama to have the right kind of service. That is why I am on the floor now. I am pleading for the people of Alabama, and for the people of all the other States. I want all of them, including my people and the Senator's people, to have the right kind of service. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that that is the reason why I am on the floor. When we get to the Senator's State, however, I think we shall find that his office will not be abolished, if my memory correctly serves me.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from Minnesota will permit me to do so, I will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] has the floor.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I simply wish to ask the Senator from Alabama if the office for the region in which New Mexico is located happens to be in Denver.

Mr. ADAMS. No; it is not.

Mr. HATCH. The regional office?

Mr. ADAMS. No.

Mr. HATCH. We shall probably have to go to Dallas.

Mr. HILL. Why, certainly. Before the Senator from New Mexico leaves the floor I want to assure him that there is a regional office at Denver, Colo., in the home State of our distinguished friend, the great Senator from Colorado; and his office not only will not be abolished but it will be en-

larged, increased, and augmented. It will greatly grow in size by drawing from the other States and the other offices.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the Senator realizes that that is inevitable by reason of the geographical location of Denver, and the beauty and attractiveness of the city.

Mr. HILL. Denver is one of the most beautiful cities I have ever seen. It is a city of rare beauty; but we do not establish offices on the basis of the beauty of the city. We sometimes do establish offices on other bases.

Region No. 8, Arkansas and Missouri: The office in Arkansas is abolished, and the part of it which is transferred will go to St. Louis.

Region No. 9: The offices in North Dakota and South Dakota are abolished and centralized in Minneapolis, Minn.

The next region: The offices in Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma are to be abolished, and the people of those States will have to be served from another State, from Kansas City, Mo., which, from this table, is not even in that region.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Since that hearing was held, the Department has decided to change the office for my State from Kansas City to Dallas, Tex. I have no objection to the change; but it simply shows that the office is to be taken away from my State either to Kansas City or to Dallas.

Mr. HILL. The Senator's office will be abolished just the same.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. The office in Nevada will be abolished, and the people of that State will have to get their service from California.

We next come to the Colorado region, where the office of Wyoming will be abolished, and the people of that State will have to go to the State of my distinguished friend from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, how many employees will be removed from Wyoming by that change?

Mr. HILL. Of course, that is only one office.

Mr. ADAMS. There is only one employee.

Mr. HILL. That is a small office. I am going to say something about the employees in a few minutes, and about the effect on the employees. I want the Senator to understand that, too.

Arizona also will have its office abolished, and the people of that State will have to go to Los Angeles, Calif.

The office in the State of the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] will be abolished.

Out on the far western coast, the office in Oregon will be abolished, and the people of that State will have to get their service, if such service be possible, from Seattle, Wash.

Mr. BONE. It will be promptly rendered.

Mr. HILL. Speaking about the personnel, let me say that the testimony shows that when these offices are abolished, a minimum of one-third of all the employees will absolutely lose their jobs on July 1. One-third more, I suppose, will have to be taken care of under the other provisions of the joint resolution which make provision for relief. They will be transferred, I suppose, to the relief rolls. In the case of the remaining third, some of them may be transferred to the regional offices, but there is no assurance that they will be transferred, or how many of them will be transferred; and even those who are transferred or have the opportunity to transfer on July 1 will have no assurance whatever that if they move from Wyoming, we will say, to Denver, Colo., they will be permitted to stay there over 30 days with a job. None of them will have any assurance at all that even if they are transferred they will not lose their jobs within 30, 60, or 90 days after being transferred.

So we have a situation in which we shall have some 29 State offices abolished, wiped out, and we shall have any number of persons discharged and turned out with no jobs; and so far as efficiency is concerned, we have before us a

striking example of the consolidation and regionalization of the H. O. L. C. offices. I do not believe there is anyone on this floor who will rise today and say that we did a wise thing or a good thing or an efficient thing when we abolished the H. O. L. C. offices.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield in order that I may make an inquiry of the Chair?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I ask the Chair whether or not section 15 of the pending joint resolution is still subject to amendment. I desire later to tender an amendment to it, and I am compelled to leave the Chamber now, and do not want to be robbed of the opportunity to tender the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Subdivision (a) of section 15 would have to be reconsidered before an amendment to that part of the joint resolution would be in order.

Mr. BONE. It is a committee amendment, and I did not know whether or not it had yet been reached in our deliberations.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on an amendment of the Senate to House bill 8913, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 13, 1940.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 to the bill (H. R. 8913) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

Provided, That hereafter the compensation of the legislative counsel of the Senate shall be at the rate of \$10,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. TYDINGS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17.

The motion was agreed to.

ARMY BANDMASTERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3840) to amend the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: That section 6 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"After the date this paragraph takes effect there shall be a number of commissioned officers, to be known as bandmasters, equal to the number of authorized bands of the Regular Army. Bandmasters shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and there shall be one bandmaster for each such band who shall be the leader thereof in lieu of a warrant officer band leader. The Secretary of War shall select a chief bandmaster from the bandmasters so appointed who shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a captain while so serving, who shall be charged with the duty of administering uniformly the affairs of all authorized bands of the Regular Army, and who shall advise the Secretary of War on all matters relating to the musical organizations in the Regular Army. Bandmasters shall be selected from band leaders in the Regular Army who are found to be physically qualified, and, subject to such examination as the President may prescribe, from noncommissioned officers and other enlisted musicians who have had at least one year of service in a band of the Regular Army, and from officers in the National Guard of the United States or in the Officers' Reserve Corps. Any bandmaster with service of less than 5 years shall be entitled to the rank, pay, allowances, and retirement benefits of a second lieutenant; and any bandmaster with service of 5 years or more shall be entitled to the rank, pay, allowances, and retirement benefits of a first lieutenant: *Provided*, That in computing such service in the case of any person appointed as a bandmaster all his active service as a band leader in the Regular Army prior to his appointment shall be counted: *Provided further*, That no person appointed as a bandmaster shall suffer the loss of any pay by reason of the provisions of this paragraph. Any warrant officer band leader who fails to pass the prescribed physical

examination because of physical disability incident to the service shall be placed upon the retired list of the Regular Army with 75 percent of the pay to which he would have been entitled if he had been appointed as a bandmaster as hereinbefore provided."

Sec. 2. The limitations now prescribed by law upon the number of commissioned officers of the Regular Army, and the number of commissioned officers in the various grades, is hereby increased to, and only to, the extent necessary to give effect to the provisions of this act. The number of warrant officers authorized by law shall be decreased by the number of band leaders who receive commissions as bandmasters in pursuance of the provisions of this act.

Sec. 3. This act may be cited as the "Army Bandmasters' Act." And the Senate agree to the same.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
SHERMAN MINTON,
CHAN GURNEY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

A. J. MAY,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
L. C. ARENDS,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

FLOYD B. OLSON—PIONEER OF SOCIAL PROGRESS

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. President, in these days of relief legislation and huge defense appropriations we find 12,000,000 unemployed, ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed in the midst of unlimited abundance. It is now certain that the old parties have no remedy or solution for our problems of today. Some day, somehow, a new party founded on the great farmer-labor elements of our population will advance its program. The program and creed of a pioneer of social legislation, Floyd B. Olson, will then lead the Nation onward toward a better and a happier day.

America today, perhaps more so than at any time in its history, needs the social and economic philosophy of the late Floyd B. Olson and the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota.

On January 4, 1933, Olson, America's first Farmer-Labor Governor, in submitting a program of social and economic reforms to a conservative State legislature, said:

We are assembled during the most crucial period in the history of our State and of our Nation. An army of unemployed, some 200,000 homeless and wandering boys, thousands of abandoned farms, an ever-increasing number of mortgage foreclosures, and thousands of people in want and poverty are evidences not only of an economic depression but of the failure of government and of our social system to function in the interest of the common happiness of the people.

Unquestionably we have made some advances since that time.

We enacted, to be sure, an Unemployment Compensation Act, for which Floyd B. Olson and the Farmer-Labor Party pioneered for years.

We placed the Wagner National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act upon our statute books, both representing principles for which Floyd B. Olson and the Farmer-Labor Party pioneered.

We have set up the National Youth Administration, which is creating some opportunities for the young people of this country—a "brain child" of Floyd B. Olson.

T. V. A., Boulder Dam, Bonneville, and Grand Coulee, all attest progress in the direction of Government ownership of power. To a limited extent, we are taking care of some of the victims of the depression and looking after some of our more unfortunate citizens; we have taken initial steps in various forms of social insurance; we have started to do something by way of slum clearance and decent housing for the poor—all planks in every Farmer-Labor platform since the party's inception.

CRISIS STILL WITH US

It is, nevertheless, true that the crisis of which Governor Olson spoke in 1933 is still with us. The avenue of opportunity for great masses of our citizens remains closed to them. More than 10,000,000 men and women, capable and willing to do useful work, are unable to find employment. To take up this unemployment slack, we are looking forward to a wartime economy, which, sad experience tells us, must have

disastrous consequences. One-third of our population is still "ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed." Wealth concentration in the hands of the few continues, while many persons are deprived of the material needs and comforts which a mass-production industry and almost limitless resources could easily supply them. Monopoly, operating in restraint of trade, now has greater control over commodity prices than ever before, and is fast destroying business competition and free private enterprise, gradually eliminating the independent merchant from American economic life. Youth has not yet found its proper place in the economic sun, and the aged have not been afforded that life of security and comfort to which they are entitled.

Government is still unable to function "in the interests of the common happiness of the people." We have not been able to keep pace with the crushing economic events of recent years because we refuse to tackle the fundamentals of our economic problems. We fear that in tackling these problems that the toes of the mighty will be trod upon. Therein lies the chief difference between the Farmer-Labor Party and the two old political parties.

AN AMERICAN LABOR PARTY

The Farmer-Labor Party is an American party, fighting for American principles, American rights, an American standard of living for all the people—a standard of living commensurate with the vast wealth which this country is able to produce.

The Farmer-Labor Party has its origin in the very soil of America. It came into existence because of the crying need for a solution of problems which neither of the old parties was able or willing to provide.

These principles and ideals, personified in Floyd B. Olson, are found in the Declaration of Independence, in this immortal passage:

We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed, by their Creator, with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men; deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.

THE BANNER TO CARRY ON

To know Floyd Olson is to realize the background from which he sprung. This great leader of the common people was a product of the economic and political trends of our Nation. His brilliant rise to public acclaim was the necessary answer to the needs of labor and farmer alike. Before there could be a Floyd Olson, before there could arise the active liberal party we have today, early political parties had to protest, fight, and die, leaving us with a banner to carry on their work. Their history and struggle is the groundwork leading to the rise of Floyd Olson and a new third party.

ORIGIN OF FARMER-LABOR PARTY

The political forbears of the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party were the Greenback-Labor, Granger, Populist, and People's Party movements, the Farmers' Alliance, Equity Cooperative Exchange, Nonpartisan League, and other progressive movements which sought to remove economic inequalities and secure economic justice for the masses. They played their roles upon the political stage, and then left the arena of politics for others to carry on. But they left an unmistakable imprint upon American life—a very deep and wholesome imprint that we see and feel today. In that sense they never disappeared. The Granger movement swept the prairies in the eighties, and the Populist movement, whose chief support came from the Northwest, rose to its heights in the nineties.

At their peak, these movements each polled about a million votes. The correctness of their position is to be found in the fact that most of the things for which they stood—for which all of the movements I have mentioned stood—have since been enacted into law.

What were some of the reforms they demanded? The Grangers fought for popular election of United States Sena-

tors, woman suffrage, Government regulation of railroads, and graduated income and inheritance taxes. The Populist Party presented a platform including demands for Government ownership of railroads, taxation in accordance with ability to pay, a graduated income tax, the initiative and referendum, postal-savings banks, and similar reforms. Its convention significantly went on record condemning the use of Federal troops in labor disputes. The fight which they conducted against monopolistic tendencies in the United States is still going on.

EARLY PROGRESSIVE VICTORIES

These early progressive campaigns were not without some victories at the polls. The revolt in Minnesota sent Ignatius Donnelly to Congress as a Progressive Republican, where he served three terms, 1862-68. From the western part of the State the Farmers' Alliance elected Kittel Halvorson to Congress, 1890-92. There were numerous local victories in Minnesota and elsewhere. The People's Party achieved signal success in Minnesota in 1898 when it joined with the Democrats to elect liberal John Lind, Governor of the State on the Democratic ticket.

FARMER AND LABOR UNITED

The argument that the Farmer-Labor Party is an unholy alliance of labor and farmer which cannot endure because these two great producers of wealth are naturally hostile and have no mutual economic interests was raised in those days. But many workers and farmers then were able to see clearly through the specious nature of this argument as labor and farmers in Minnesota see through it today. They detected that its real purpose was to keep them separated, to make it easier for their enemies to exploit them. One of the outstanding contributions of the Farmer-Labor Party to the progressive political life of America is that it has not only proven that the worker and the farmer can cooperate to their mutual advantage politically, but that it is necessary that they do so if they are to attain real economic emancipation. Once that fact is brought home to the toilers of this country the ultimate victory of the common people is assured.

The immediate predecessor of the Farmer-Labor Party was the Nonpartisan League, which attained commanding political power in North Dakota and wielded much influence in adjoining States, particularly Minnesota. No political movement in this country was more deliberately vilified and misrepresented by the press than the Nonpartisan League. No impartial student of this movement, however, will dispute the fact that it brought great and lasting benefits to the people of North Dakota.

THE MINNESOTA MOVEMENT

In Minnesota the militant farmers, organized in the Nonpartisan League, joined hands politically with militant city labor, organized in the Working People's Nonpartisan Political League, forming the basis for the Farmer-Labor Party. At first the strategy was to capture the Republican Party, at that time the dominant political party of the State. Although the name "Farmer-Labor" first appeared on a Minnesota ballot in 1918, and in all subsequent elections, winning a signal success in the contest for the United States Senate in 1922, it was not until 1924 that they decided to disband the Nonpartisan League and the Working People's Nonpartisan Political League and to form a full-fledged political party.

This political movement of labor and farmer, which welcomed into its fold the independent business and professional people, entered the scene during the fitful days of the first World War. The party was opposed to America's entrance into that war; it opposed sending the flower of American youth to die on foreign battlefields for a cause that was not its own. That made it possible, once war was declared, for professional patrioteers to organize a merciless attack against its leaders. These superpatriots saw, in this period of war hysteria, a chance to overthrow a young, virile political movement that threatened to storm the citadel of entrenched wealth.

WITCH-HUNTING DAYS

It took courage to be Farmer-Labor in those days. Mob fury was whipped up against them. Tar and feathers, near-

lynchings, physical assaults, and many other forms of mob violence were the order of the day. Houses of Farmer-Labor leaders were painted yellow, and they were held up to public scorn and opprobrium. Goaded on by the notorious Minnesota Public Safety Commission, even the university board of regents engaged in vicious witch-hunting by discharging the head of the department of political science, a national authority in his field and one of the most beloved professors at the university, on a flimsy charge of pro-Germanism which had all the earmarks of having been trumped up. There was not even a semblance of a fair hearing. I am glad to say that the university regents, under a Farmer-Labor administration, have since removed this stain from the university's record by exonerating this professor and conferring upon him the title of professor emeritus.

OLSON ENTERS THE ARENA

In that era of witch hunting, a young and at that time unheard-of Minneapolis lawyer, Floyd B. Olson, went into the Hennepin County District Court to make a name for himself by defending James A. Peterson, a Minneapolis attorney, who was indicted for daring to oppose this country's entrance into the World War. This young lawyer was later to become the State's and the Nation's first Farmer-Labor Governor and a most outstanding champion of the underprivileged. The persecution of Peterson set off a spark in Olson that only death extinguished.

Following the war, growth of the Farmer-Labor Party was stimulated by the double-barreled campaign of the reactionaries to destroy labor unions and make the farmer the first victim of a heartless deflation.

The history of the progressive movements of the Northwest records a host of names of illustrious pioneers, now dead. In addition to Donnelly, Halvorson, and Lind, there are Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr., Sidney W. Owen, Dave Evans, Magnus Johnson, John A. Johnson, James Manahan, W. J. Carss, Knud Wefald, O. J. Kvale, George Loftus, Dr. L. A. Fritchie, Thomas Van Lear, Fred E. Tillquist, A. C. Welch, Thomas Meighan, Fred Pike, Andrew Devold, and many others.

BEGINS POLITICAL CAREER

Floyd Olson—humanitarian, man of peace, man of action, realist and dreamer, practical politician and idealist—started his political career as a member of the Democratic Party. In 1920, at the age of 29, while he was assistant Hennepin County attorney, he made the race as a candidate for Congress on the Democratic ticket from the Fifth Minnesota Congressional District.

At that time this was one of the Republican strongholds of the State, and his defeat from the outset was regarded as a foregone conclusion. This district is still conservative, though moving toward the liberal column.

Olson entered that campaign because he had a message for the people. This he delivered fearlessly. In that sense he achieved the victory he sought, because, sterling orator that he was, he got an audience, and people listened to him.

JOINS FARMER-LABOR PARTY

It did not take long for the leaders and the rank and file of the vigorous, fast-growing political movement of labor, the farmers, and the independent business and professional groups to discover that this young, raw-boned, confident, fighting giant, at whose eloquence people marveled, was of their own flesh and blood; that his ideology was their ideology; that he was fighting the same forces that they were fighting—that he and they were crusading in a common battle, with identical objectives. And it did not take long for this product of Minneapolis' melting pot to discover in this liberal movement the outlet for his own social and economic philosophy.

A movement with a genuine mission is always certain to find a dynamic leader, a personality with the necessary courage, fighting zeal, ability, and resourcefulness to take its message to the people. In Floyd Olson the Farmer-Labor Party found that leadership.

In 1924 Olson was nominated on the Farmer-Labor ticket for Governor. That was the year that "Fighting Bob" La

Follette of Wisconsin, at the behest of the liberal forces of the Nation, made his bid for the presidency of the United States on an independent ticket. He campaigned the State for the national independents and for the Farmer-Labor Party, and himself came within 40,000 votes of being elected Governor. This amazing run stunned the Republican machine. In 1930 he was elected Governor by an overwhelming vote, and reelected in 1932 and 1934 by staggering majorities.

OLSON'S PHILOSOPHY

The crusading spirit of the Farmer-Labor Party appealed to him. Frequently, in addressing Farmer-Labor meetings or conventions, he called attention to that crusading spirit and the need for preserving it. As long as a political movement retains its crusading characteristic its ship will never be wrecked on the shoals of opportunism.

What were some of the things that Floyd Olson and the Farmer-Labor Party advocated? What was his philosophy of life, his philosophy of government—the Farmer-Labor philosophy of life and of government?

He and his party advocated stimulating business and restoring prosperity by aiding those at the bottom of the economic ladder rather than those at the top; developing a high standard of living through compulsory payment of living wages for the worker and placing agriculture on a parity with industry by Government guarantee of cost of production and a fair profit; removing the unfair advantages which the fast-expanding chains and monopolies enjoy in competition with independent business; equalizing educational opportunities; payment of decent professional salaries to school teachers and strengthening teachers' tenure; aiding growth of both consumer and producer cooperatives; Government ownership and operation of public utilities in the interest of the people; taxes based upon ability to pay; opening the door of opportunity to our young people; providing security for the aged, and the physically handicapped; maternity, health, accident, and other forms of social insurance; social security for all members of society.

Olson advocated an economy of abundance rather than an economy of scarcity. The latter he held to be a confession of fatal error in our economic system. He opposed payment of benefits to farmers to produce less foodstuffs; he favored rather payment of benefits to farmers to produce more foodstuffs and to distribute this food to the hungry men, women, and children of this country.

WANT IN MIDST OF PLENTY

Suffering and want in the midst of plenty presented a challenge to the Nation's economists—and still does. Olson clearly saw the unjustified and unwarranted contradiction. Said he:

We find granaries bursting and thousands starving; cotton piled high in warehouses, millions insufficiently clad, and prices so low as to be the despair of the planter; banks bulging with money, and widespread poverty; machinery equipment standing idle with multitudes in need of the things the machine could produce; mountains of coal and people freezing; able-bodied men and women, eager to work, forced to take the necessities of life for themselves and their children from charity.

He insisted that the industrial practices of the past were responsible for the deplorable conditions of today, and maintained that a system motivated by the element of "blind and selfish profit" must inevitably result in concentration of wealth on the one hand and concentration of poverty on the other. He read into the record of bankruptcies, business failures, and mortgage foreclosures the gradual elimination of the middle class.

Had a foreign foe, he once said, invaded our shores, taken the savings away from millions of small bank depositors, driven hundreds of thousands of small farmers off their farms, seized furniture and chattels of millions of families, all the manpower of the Nation would be thrown into a titanic struggle to expel the invader. But our foe has come from within. And as the people of old ran to their Government beseeching protection from the raiding horse-men of the foreign foe, so today people are asking Government aid from the perils here at home.

DUTIES OF GOVERNMENT

While Floyd Olson was a severe critic of the present economic order, his criticism was constructive in nature. He

did not want to destroy anything that is good; he wanted to destroy only that which is evil. He wanted to build the house on a solid foundation. But he did not believe in glossing over faults; he did not hesitate to call attention to the pitfalls. He was convinced that unless we saw the picture clearly, faced the issues courageously, and possessed the intelligence to do something about it, there some day would come a sad awakening.

The chief fault, in his opinion, lay in our inability to distribute equitably the tremendous wealth which we are able to produce—that we were suffering not from overproduction but rather from underconsumption due to insufficient mass purchasing power. Economists are becoming more and more convinced that only a great increase in mass purchasing power, bringing about a higher standard of living, can bring permanent prosperous conditions and solve unemployment.

The remedy, Olson insisted, must come from governmental action. He had no confidence that industry, if left to itself, would or could do the job. He maintained that it was the duty of government to restrain the strong and defend the weak, and said that—

A nation cannot be preserved which does not preserve its citizens. Industry is retrenching—

He asserted—

reducing wages, lowering the standard of living, destroying buying power, and throwing more and more men and women on the streets to shift for themselves. Just how that is going to solve our economic problems is beyond understanding.

To the allegation that Government effort to bring about better economic conditions would be destructive of individual liberty, he once replied:

Whose liberty? Liberty for what purpose? Liberty of the Citizens' Alliance to arm thugs to shoot defenseless strikers in the back? Liberty of promoters of spurious stocks to fleece widows and orphans? Liberty of millionaires to escape taxation? Liberty to make slaves of workers and serfs of farmers? These are the individual liberties that these people mean.

OLSON'S YOUTH

Floyd Bjornsterne Olson was the offspring of immigrant parents—a Norwegian lumberjack, Paul A. Olson, who came to America from now war-torn Trondheim, and a Swedish servant girl whose birthplace was in Varmland, Sweden. They were married in Minneapolis and their only child was born to them on November 13, 1891.

Mrs. Olson selected Floyd as the first name for their son because she wanted to give him an American name and Floyd sounded nice to her. Bjornsterne was the father's choice for the second name in memory of the Norwegian poet, Bjornsterne Bjornson, whom he revered. But none of Floyd's friends ever knew that his second name was Bjornsterne, and he never took the pains to tell them. Matter of fact, his second name appears in his high-school records as William, a much "safer" name.

It was a modest, humble home in which Floyd Olson first saw the light of day—a poor workingman's home in a poor workingman's neighborhood, but a neat and refined home. The houses in the district have since been cleared away for a slum-clearance project, but friends of Olson's saw to it that the house in which he was born is preserved for posterity. It is now an attraction in one of the North Minneapolis parks.

But Floyd Olson's boyhood neighborhood was not depressive despite its unmistakable evidences of poverty. It was not a slum district in those days as we generally understand the meaning of that term. There were plenty of wide, open spaces for the boys to play in. The youngsters were a rough and ready sort, in whose company a mollicoddle was just out of luck—and there was nothing of the mollicoddle about Floyd. The boys were filled with the zest of life. They engaged in normal pastimes, played baseball, football, did ice skating, went fishing; they formed their gangs; fought—sometimes for the sheer fun of it; and sometimes played "hookey" from school.

HUMBLE BEGINNINGS

Floyd was pretty much like the rest of them. He liked his play, especially when the play was hard. He was particularly good at baseball, running, and skating; delighted in playing

pranks; and always went along with the rest of them on their escapades.

He was a normal boy, but he had one distinct advantage over the rest of his playmates—his mental keenness made it easy for him to get his school work done in jig time. He thus seldom came to school with lessons unprepared, no matter how long he played. He liked to read, his tastes running to such works as Dumas' *The Count of Monte Cristo*, Victor Hugo's *Les Miserables*, and detective and Wild West stories. Even as Governor he was able to relax by reading good detective stories. Much of his spare time he devoted to memorizing and reciting passages, which varied from Casey at the Bat to Hamlet's soliloquy, *To Be or Not To Be*. These recitations greatly delighted his cronies, and they showed him off on occasions.

Most of the children in the neighborhood had to supplement their parents' meager incomes in various ways. Floyd sold newspapers. During the summer fishing season he picked up a few pennies by catching frogs and selling them for bait. He was fond of animal pets and went in for raising rabbits and pigeons not for financial reasons but rather as a hobby. That explains why he once kept a large delegation at the Capitol waiting for more than an hour because he took to a veterinarian "for repairs" an injured bird he observed fluttering alongside the roadway.

"THEY CAN'T TELL ME THAT'S RIGHT"—FLOYD

It was an impressionistic neighborhood in which Floyd Olson was reared. In a sense, it symbolized the very essence of Americanism—everything that America stands for. It was a neighborhood of mixed nationalities—of people who had come to this country to find not a life of ease, but rather reward for honest toil, opportunity for themselves and for their children, a chance in life. There were blond Vikings from the northland, deep-throated Germans, Irish, French, English, Welsh, Scotch, Jews, Slavs—in fact, all the races that form America's great melting pot which makes this country different from and more hopeful than any other land on earth.

On the outskirts of the neighborhood were many beautiful homes, and Floyd, even in his early days as a youngster, set to wondering why it was that some people could afford to live in those pretentious houses while other people, who worked infinitely harder, had to live in simple and even dilapidated houses; why the wives of the rich could employ servants to do their work while the equally good wives of the poor workers had to do scrubbing and mending and cleaning all day long which sapped from them all their energies. "They can't tell me that's right," he would remark. And he disliked the school teacher who preached a Pollyanna philosophy that "God's in His heaven, all's well with the world."

During his high-school years, when he achieved fame as a debater, those thoughts more and more impressed themselves upon his mind, and he was more intent on finding the answer. He discussed these matters with some of his teachers, who tried "to put his thinking straight." In reality it was he that was trying to put their thinking straight.

ANCHORED WITH THE POOR

More adventure was packed into the life of Floyd Olson from the time that he graduated from North High School in Minneapolis in 1909 to the time that he received his law diploma from the Northwestern College of Law in Minneapolis in 1915, from which he graduated as the valedictorian of his class, than is contained in the entire life of the average person. He went in for manual labor; became a freight handler in Minneapolis railroad yards; took to the harvest fields of Minnesota and the Dakotas; tried his hand as a house-to-house book salesman; did lumberjacking; worked as a scowman on the Fraser River in Canada; took a fling at gold mining in the Canadian Rockies; and attended the University of Minnesota College of Law for a year before entering the Northwestern College of Law.

American history is replete with tales of poor boys who "made good," and surely Floyd B. Olson, of humble beginnings and of humble origin, must be placed in that class. But that does not tell the real story—it does not give an accurate pic-

ture of the life and significance of this remarkable man. He never said "good-bye" to the world of poverty in which he was reared; he never pulled up his anchor from that world; he never left it behind him as so many others do. In that world he maintained his friends, his sentiments, his attachments; he always remained part and parcel of it. And he went through life with a burning mission to do something to help ease the life of all people who suffered, socially and economically, as did the working people in the district in which he grew up.

A REMARKABLE MAN

It is often asked how far Olson would have gone up the ladder of national fame had fate decreed for him a longer span of life. There is no telling. Possessing in abundance the sterling qualities of leadership that put men on top—vision, courage, capacity, a magnetic personality, the art of inspiring others—it is almost certain that the liberals of America would have selected him to head a new national political movement.

He possessed not only unusual charm and eloquence as a speaker but unusually marked ability in many directions. He was a man of almost unbelievable versatility and of great intellectual stature. Had he chosen the stage as a career, he unquestionably would have reached the foremost ranks of that profession. When he played the leading role in his senior high-school class play his teachers were so amazed at the display of histrionic talent by this youngster that they urged him to continue along that path. Had he chosen journalism as a profession he also would have excelled, since he wrote with an ease, a facility, a penetration, and a grasp of subject matter that was at once a source of envy and admiration of newspapermen and writers who knew him.

Hundreds of practicing lawyers in the Northwest today still remember Floyd Olson as their teacher at the Minnesota College of Law. He had the faculty of imparting knowledge to others with a lucidity that made the most intricate problem appear relatively simple; no other teachers at the law school could approach him in that respect. His classes were always crowded.

OLSON AS A LAWYER

As prosecuting attorney, Minnesota never saw the equal of Olson. His ready wit, his ability to anticipate every stratagem of the opposition made him the scourge of criminal lawyers when he was Hennepin County attorney; he excelled them at their own game; he beat them to every punch, so to speak. Personally, these lawyers loved and admired him because he never violated his word; never took an unfair advantage; always kept their confidences. However, they dreaded the very sight of Floyd Olson taking the opposite seat in the courtroom.

But, as he excelled as prosecuting attorney, so was he equally effective in arguing a case at law before the court. Federal judges in Minneapolis will tell you that they never heard a more masterful presentation of State's rights than when Olson appeared personally before them to defend his action in calling out the National Guard and proclaiming martial law during the now famous truck drivers' strike when the antilabor forces sought to restrain him by Federal injunction action. The courts, you can be sure, did not seek to give the Farmer-Labor governor the best of it, but they nonetheless sustained his legal contentions.

The corporations of Minnesota were quick to recognize Olson's legal talents—and it is no secret that he was the recipient of very flattering offers for his services if he should desire to give up his public career to enter private law practice. Fortunately for the common people of Minnesota—and the common people of America—he thought in terms of public service, not in terms of becoming a rich man.

As an orator, Olson had few who approached him—none who excelled him. At no time did he ever become boring to his audience, no matter how late the hour nor how long the speech; no audience ever walked out on him. Now serious, now talking in a light vein, now accusing, now "calling

the roll," as he called it, he was always able to keep the interest of his audience at a high pitch until he concluded.

HENNEPIN COUNTY ATTORNEY

The first public office held by Floyd Olson was that of assistant Hennepin County attorney, to which office he was appointed in 1919. This is the largest county in the State, in which is situated the city of Minneapolis. The board of county commissioners the following year named him county attorney when the chief was removed from office. He thus became the youngest man ever to hold that important office.

So excellent a record did Olson make as prosecutor that he was elected to that office in 1922 and reelected in 1926 by the biggest majorities that county had ever given a candidate for public office.

Two series of investigations, followed by successful prosecutions, which Olson conducted as county attorney, won for him national attention. The first was in 1925, when he went before a county grand jury and obtained indictments against several leaders of the Ku Klux Klan. These Klansmen were tried, convicted, and sent to prison—the first successful prosecution of the Klan in the entire country.

The young county attorney in 1926 again displayed his mettle when he conducted an inquiry into municipal graft and corruption in Minneapolis, and sent several members of the city council to the penitentiary for accepting bribes. Before entering upon this investigation he was warned that he could go through with it only with the most dire consequences to himself. These threats, instead of deterring him, merely made him more determined.

"JUSTICE"—HIS RECORD

Olson was different from other prosecutors in that he never enjoyed the smell of blood in "getting" his victim; he did not glory in having another successful prosecution chalked up to his record. He did not regard the record in itself as of primary importance. The only thing that counted was to what extent he had furthered the ends of justice. The role of prosecutor never hardened him; rather it gave him a keener insight into the frailties of man.

An implacable foe of the professional criminal, he differentiated between the criminally inclined and those led into the ways of crime through adverse economic circumstances. While his record of convictions obtained was one of the best in the country, he likewise appeared more often in court to plead leniency for defendants whom he thought would become useful members of society if extended a helping hand. Proportionately more first offenders received probation in Minneapolis and Hennepin County as the result of intercession by Olson with the court than in any other large city or county in the United States. The social correctness of Olson's position is supported by the fact that most of the first offenders for whom he obtained probation made good instead of becoming hardened criminals, which so often happens when they are sent to prison.

A case which serves as an excellent portrayal of Olson, the humanitarian, and his fearless social outlook was when a young man pleaded guilty to a charge of embezzlement of funds from his employer, one of the giant corporations of the Northwest. This young man, married, handled thousands of dollars of the bank's funds daily. He was compelled to maintain a social front in accordance with the "respectable" position that he held—and he had to do this on a monthly salary of less than \$100. He succumbed to temptation.

Olson asked the court to extend probation to the defendant, and during the course of his plea for the young man he declared that the bank for which he worked was equally, if not more so, guilty of the crime. In the eyes of the court this was tantamount to committing lese majesty—an insolent slur against the very pillar of the city's financial respectability.

EXPOSES CITIZENS ALLIANCE PLOT

Another incident, still vividly recalled by newspaper reporters who covered the courthouse run in Minneapolis in those days, occurred during a labor strike in North Minneapolis.

The strike was in connection with an electrical job in a school-house. There had been an explosion, apparently caused by dynamite, which had all the earmarks of sabotage. The damage was very slight—intentionally slight, as proved to be the case.

The same night, following the explosion, a drunken union man had been arrested in the vicinity by the police, who found several sticks of dynamite on his person. Obviously here was conclusive proof that the union was behind this dastardly dynamite plot.

The newsmen had gathered early the next morning at the county attorney's office for a statement, but the statement was not immediately forthcoming. This man, destined to become a prominent leader, was conducting an independent investigation of the case; he had refused to accept as conclusive the confession that the police had extracted from the prisoner. While the newspaper reporters were "cooling their heels" outside his office, Olson himself was examining this man.

When he was ready with his statement to the press it did not make the kind of a story for which the editors of the dailies were holding their presses. It was not the kind of a story for which the banner headlines held in readiness could be used.

Olson told the reporters that his investigation disclosed the fact that the prisoner the previous night had been in company of certain persons who got him intoxicated, that these persons purchased the dynamite and "planted" it on his person, and that a check as to the identity of these individuals further disclosed that they were stool pigeons in the employ of the Minneapolis Citizens Alliance, a notorious organization of the city's open-shop employers.

If there is to be a prosecution in this case—

He told the reporters—

it will not be of the prisoner but rather of the president of the Citizens Alliance. I charge specifically that this was a plot hatched by paid agents in his employ for the purpose of discrediting the union.

It was then that Olson first incurred the enmity of the Minneapolis Citizens Alliance—an enmity, he it said to his everlasting credit, that followed him to his very grave. Without question the Minneapolis Citizens Alliance was one of the most vicious antilabor organizations in the entire country, setting a national pattern for anti-labor practices.

OLSON ACCOMPLISHMENTS

In considering the accomplishments of the Olson administrations it is well to bear in mind that in not a single instance did he have the support of a liberal legislature. This fact makes these accomplishments the more remarkable.

Time after time, in order to compel legislative action on vital social measures, such as passage of relief bills, it was necessary for him to go before the people. This very often was productive of good results; it had a salutary effect upon the conservative members; they feared public opinion, and Olson was a master in marshaling public opinion to his aid.

This lack of legislative support was one of Floyd Olson's greatest disappointments in public office. Said he in his last address before a Farmer-Labor convention:

I look back at my three terms as Governor with one great regret. I did not have, on any occasion, a majority of the members of the legislature who agreed with the principles of this (Farmer-Labor) movement. To have had that, I say from my very heart—to have had that in any one session—would have been sufficient gratification so that I would have been willing thereafter to retire from public life.

The election of a liberal Governor and a conservative legislature is one of the anomalies of American political life.

His accomplishments, nevertheless, stand out as one of the most significant progressive achievements of modern-day America.

NATIONAL GUARD CALLED TO PROTECT LABOR

The workers and the farmers of Minnesota—the two large groups whose labor produces most of our social wealth—as well as the independent business and professional groups,

know what it means to them to have political action of their own.

While old party politicians, even those claiming to be friends of labor, render lip service to the cause of the workers by talking of "the rights of labor," "the dignity of labor," and utter similarly flattering phrases, it remained for a Farmer-Labor Governor, Floyd B. Olson, to be the first State executive in America to call out the State militia during a labor strike for the purpose of protecting the civil rights of the workers and the public in general. He did not call out the troops against the strikers. Olson showed how a people's Governor acts in a crisis when he called out the National Guard during the now famous 1934 truck drivers' strike in Minneapolis.

I've covered a lot of strikes and I've seen a lot of National Guards in action—

Said the late Paul Y. Anderson, nationally known Washington correspondent and winner of the Pulitzer prize for reporting, when he came to Minneapolis to cover the strike for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch—

but this is the first time I have ever seen the National Guard being used to help the laboring man instead of shooting him down. In fact, it is so unusual that my paper thought it worth while to send me over a thousand miles to cover it. There are 47 Governors in 47 other States, and you can bet that they are watching this with a great deal of interest.

In this strike so-called employers' advisory committee, at the behest of the Minneapolis Citizens Alliance, declined to accept Governor Olson's proposed terms for settlement of the strike—terms extremely fair to both sides. Two things prompted the Citizens Alliance to reject Olson's proposals—they saw in the strike a golden opportunity to crush organized labor; they also refused because they feared that acceptance would add to the political prestige of the Farmer-Labor administration. The latter argument was definitely advanced when the committee met in executive session to discuss the proposal, several members of the committee later divulged.

Although the employers in the so-called market group voted 19 to 3 for settlement of their differences with their workers, they were restrained from doing so by the Citizens Alliance.

POLICE PROVOKE "INCIDENT"

The troops were called out by Governor Olson after an "incident" deliberately provoked by the Minneapolis police, at that time under the thumb of the Citizens Alliance. This occurred in the market district of the city, where a truck containing a handful of merchandise was moved under police convoy. The fact that the truck was going to be moved, as well as the exact time of moving, was advertised in advance by a news item in all Minneapolis papers.

The "incident" was carefully planned and ruthlessly executed. As soon as strikers got in the path of the truck to prevent its being moved, police opened fire. The workers, in panic, fled, but the police pursued them relentlessly, shooting some down as far as 4 or 5 blocks from the scene of disturbance. More than 50 workers were shot; some were killed. An investigation immediately conducted by Governor Olson produced the startling fact that virtually every one of the wounded and killed strikers was shot in the back. It was a cold-blooded assault upon unarmed men. Not a single striker was found to have carried firearms.

The police—and by police I do not mean the rank and file—were prepared to mop up on the workers at whatever price it entailed in human blood and win the strike for the Citizens Alliance. But they failed to reckon with the fact that Minnesota had a Farmer-Labor Governor. It did not, however, take them very long to find that out—and neither did it take the workers long to find out that they had in Olson a Governor different from any other Governor of any other State.

RAIDS CITIZENS ALLIANCE

Governor Olson was in possession of information of the part being played by the Citizens Alliance to prevent a settlement of the strike. He knew that employers who wanted to settle with their workers were being intimidated, and threatened with financial ruin if they did not follow the line laid

down for them. To fix responsibility he ordered the National Guard to conduct a raid of the Citizens Alliance headquarters.

Although it is known that a tip-off was received by the Alliance enabling them to remove a truckload of telltale evidence, sufficient documents were seized to establish responsibility for the strike. The documents disclosed not only the part that the small, controlling group within the Alliance had been playing in the current strike, but also revealed that the Alliance maintained an elaborate spy system within the labor unions; employed agents provocateur to stir up labor strife; and cooperated with other antilabor forces in various sections of the country in carrying on antilabor espionage, strikebreaking, and similar activities. It likewise showed that the Alliance maintained a powerful lobby at the statehouse for the purpose of defeating all labor and liberal legislation.

Governor Olson exposed the activities of the Citizens Alliance in a radio address to the citizens of Minneapolis, who were shocked by the revelations of the intrigue carried on by a group which did not represent the sentiments of the great majority of employers of the city. In such disrepute was the Alliance placed that it later felt it necessary to change its name. The Minneapolis Citizens Alliance no longer exists as such.

Federal mediators were called in to help settle the strike. After a bitter, needless struggle the terms finally accepted by both sides were substantially the same as the terms originally proposed by Olson as a fair basis of settlement. Several lives would have been spared, bloodshed averted, and millions of dollars saved had Olson's sage advice been accepted from the beginning.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABOVE PROPERTY RIGHTS

Olson regarded the preservation of human life as more important than the preservation of property. When the strikers at the Hormel plant in Austin, Minn., in 1933 seized the company property Olson, instead of calling out the National Guard to expel the workers by force, for which certain antilabor elements clamored, went there in person.

I am dealing with intelligent people on both sides, and I am satisfied that they will listen to reason—

He said. Both sides did listen to his intelligent appeal, and submitted their case for determination to the State industrial commission. The Hormel plant today enjoys a national reputation for its enlightened labor-relations policy.

In the case of two other labor strikes in Minneapolis—the Flour City Ornamental Iron Works and the Strutwear Knitting Co.—Governor Olson took drastic steps to close down the plants in order to prevent riot and bloodshed. In the Flour City strike two innocent bystanders were killed when the police broke up a group picketing the factory.

Not only did the Governor close the factory—

Commented the Pope County Tribune editorially—

but he had the real leaders in labor get together with the industrial leaders and iron out their differences. The result is that the factory is now operating and the differences have been adjusted.

Other newspapers in the State were not so fair to the Governor.

LABOR'S RIGHT TO ORGANIZE

Replying to the strictures of the Federal court for his closing of the Strutwear Knitting Co. plant, Governor Olson said it was "an impressive enunciation of the constitutional sacredness of property rights." But significantly added that the court might have included "a hint to the plaintiffs—the Strutwear Co.—respecting arbitration."

Olson believed not only in the right of labor to organize and to bargain collectively but in the need of labor organization as an instrument for developing a higher standard of living for the people.

The unorganized worker—

Said he in his 1932 campaign keynote address—

owes a debt of gratitude to his organized brother. If his living standard has not been beaten down to the level of the Russian peasant of the Czarist days, it is due to the demands the organized worker has been able to enforce. The former has benefited from the struggles and sacrifices of the latter.

In another address he declared:

The rights which labor has won labor must fight to protect. The rights which humanity hopes to acquire, that of social security, has not as yet been won, and labor must fight to win it. The only means through which labor can win its own battle and its fight for the entire human race is through organization.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Governor Olson waged one of the first fights in this country for compulsory unemployment insurance.

In 1931, several years before the idea was advanced and enacted into law by the New Deal, he pleaded with a reactionary legislature to pass an unemployment insurance law. "Charity and doles," he told the legislature, "should not have to be depended on to protect the working people and to preserve buying power." The Governor's recommendations were not carried out.

Again, in a special message to the Minnesota Legislature on February 25, 1933, Olson, renewing the fight, recommended a program for compulsory unemployment insurance, and said:

If industry had taken care of this in the so-called prosperity years, we would not have this situation. The numbers of unemployed are increasing. It ill behoves industry to come forward and say that we should not do this. It now remains for the State to do what industry failed to do. This program is for the purpose of protecting the welfare of the people, not for the purpose of protecting profits.

Reaction also won the second round of this fight, and the program was turned down. Victory, however, finally rested on the banner of this mighty social pioneer. During his last term of office, already stricken by a dread disease, word came to him that Congress had passed the Social Security Act, with its provision for unemployment insurance under "Grants to States for unemployment compensation administration." Great credit should be given to Governor Olson and to the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota for helping to lay the groundwork for this law.

ADDITIONAL BENEFITS TO LABOR

Clearly foreseeing the need for a public works program to provide employment and to stimulate industry, Floyd Olson in 1931 succeeded in putting such a program through the legislature. This program consisted of construction of a new State office building, extensive work on State institutions which had been permitted to lapse into a state of disrepair as the result of a false policy of economy under a previous administration, and similar public works projects, thus giving employment to thousands of needy persons. This also was long before the Federal Government embarked upon a public works program to relieve unemployment.

When it was found necessary to reduce State expenditures Governor Olson vigorously opposed the conservative program to slash wages and salaries of State employees. He stated that he was not opposed to reduction of salaries of State officers and employees in the high-salaried brackets, but would not agree to salary reduction of those in the low-salaried brackets. He pointed out that, "when salaries are cut it is a long, tedious, and sometimes bitter process before they are restored to their proper level, even though economic conditions have righted themselves." Prevailing standards of pay for the rank-and-file employees were always maintained.

ANTI-INJUNCTION LAW

Although the State legislature declined to enact legislation recommended by the Governor—that wages paid on public works carried on either directly or indirectly by the State or by contract with the State "must be equal to the highest prevailing scale of wages paid for the particular kind of work performed"—Olson, nevertheless, directed the commissioner of highways to formulate a contract code carrying out that principle.

Of great benefit to labor was an anti-injunction law passed by the legislature at the insistence of Governor Olson, patterned after the Norris-LaGuardia Federal injunction law. The workmen's compensation law was strengthened during Olson's administration and great advances made in plant inspection and installation of safety devices to protect workers.

Only a small percentage of the labor and social laws recommended by Governor Olson were adopted by the Minnesota Legislatures; but even in the legislation which failed passage the battle was not lost. In the social and economic struggle a good battle waged which does not reach its goal is not a battle lost; the ground is merely prepared for future successes.

BENEFITS TO FARMERS

Governor Olson, in 1933, did something for the farmers and the home owners not only of Minnesota but of the entire United States, which stands out as one of the most significant progressive achievements of recent years.

On February 4 of that year he issued a proclamation which marked a milestone in the great struggle for economic justice. If you will recall, that was a time when hundreds of thousands of people—in the cities and on the farms—were losing their homes acquired through a lifetime of savings through mortgage foreclosures because of inability to meet interest and principal payments. The economic factors which contrived to bring about that sad state of affairs were beyond the control of their victims; the depression was none of their making.

Go back with me to the dark days of 1931–32 and the early part of 1933. We see thousands of banks collapsing, millions of unemployed and hungry, thousands of families being driven from their homes, while the sound of the sheriff's hammer and the auctioneer's voice rose loud in the land—Bid! Bid! What will you bid for this old homestead?

People have suffered and died for this home. They fought the Indians, the plagues of nature, and the inhumanity of man for this little plot of land. They loved, they suffered, they bled, they died for this little home. But bid. Bid! Bid! Bid for a mother's heartache and a child's tear. Bid for a father's sullen anger and a youth's wild despair. Hoover says we must pay our debts in gold or grass will grow on the streets. The banks of Wall Street want a stable currency even if it unstabilizes the whole Nation. Bid, bid, bid for a vanished dream and a home that should have been a haven and a refuge.

While other Governors of equally sovereign States did nothing to ameliorate the sufferings beyond expressing sympathy with the plight of the poor wretches, Minnesota's Floyd Olson ordered—

That each and every sheriff and each and every constable and police officer of the State of Minnesota refrain and desist until May 1, 1933, or until further notice, from foreclosing or attempting to foreclose any mortgage upon real estate upon which the mortgagor has his residence, furniture, and household goods used by the householder mortgagor; farm machinery and livestock in use and possessed by a mortgagor actively engaged in farming and agriculture in the hands of the producer thereof.

MORTGAGE MORATORIUM LAW

In the eyes of the great financial interests of the State and of the Nation, Governor Olson's mortgage moratorium proclamation meant nothing short of revolution—an interference with the sacred rights of property. To Floyd Olson and to the people, however, it meant the savings of hundreds of thousands of city homes and farms for their rightful owners.

The proclamation, the legality of which was immediately challenged in the courts, gave to a harassed people the necessary breathing spell. It brought the flood of mortgage foreclosures in the State to an abrupt stop.

But this was only the first step, a very bold and necessary step that accomplished its purpose. Before his opponents could bring him into court, Olson, marshaling public opinion to his side, presented to the State legislature his now famous mortgage moratorium law. A sullen body of lawmakers, sensing the temper of the people, passed the act, the first of its kind enacted in America.

A long fight in the courts followed, the law finally being held constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States. This ushered in an altogether new concept of property rights—the right of the State to protect the property of its citizens during a period of great economic upheaval over which the people have no control. Minnesota, under

a Farmer-Labor Governor, showed the country the way. Other States and the nation followed.

PROBLEMS OF FARMER

The Farmer-Labor Party program for the farmer, for which Floyd Olson fought, included Government guarantee to the farmer of cost of production plus a fair profit; scaling down of farm debts incurred during a period of heartless farm deflation; reduction of farm-mortgage interest rates; and reduction of farm taxes.

Government guarantee to the farmer of cost of production plus a fair profit is the keystone of this program, which must be enacted if agriculture is to be taken out of its state of chaos. The Government has protected railroads and other public utilities by fixing rates and charges which guarantee a fair return not only upon invested capital but upon watered stock as well.

They—

Meaning the utilities, said Olson—

have secured special legislation because they have a greater voice in government than have the farmers. If I had the power, I would not hesitate to fix prices of farm products commensurate with the cost of production and sound-business practice. No business can exist when it sells its products for less than it costs to produce them. When the farmer receives an inadequate price for his products he cannot purchase the products manufactured by capital through the agency of labor; labor is consequently unemployed, and capital becomes insolvent.

MORTGAGE RELIEF

In 1933 he asked the State legislature to set an example for the rest of the country in its approach to the farm problem by passing legislation enabling the State Rural Credit Bureau, which held millions of dollars in farm-mortgage loans, to adjust farm-mortgage indebtedness—

To enable the mortgagor not only to pay the State the reduced amount of principal, but also to retain his farm.

In effect, this is what Governor Olson told the legislature:

The State made loans of \$61,000,000 to the farmer. When these loans were made the purchasing power of the dollar was much less than it is today. To ask the farmer to pay back dollar for dollar is in reality asking him to pay back more than he received. Conditions now make it impossible for him to do this. We might as well approach the situation realistically and take our—the State's—losses now, if losses there be. So should every mortgage holder. It is an injustice to force payment of a dollar now for a dollar loaned in 1925. Besides, if we enforce collection we shall merely be taking the farms away from their rightful owners. The entire country will suffer.

The legislature did not pass such an act, but on the Governor's instructions the rural credit bureau did adopt a policy of leniency with respect to mortgage payments and foreclosures, and no farmer who wanted to stay on his land and operate his farm was driven off by the State.

I shall subsequently discuss aid to the farmer under Governor Olson's administration by way of tax relief, under the subject matter of tax reform.

When the Federal Government embarked upon a program of rural electrification, Governor Olson asked the Minnesota Legislature to pass enabling legislation to aid in carrying out this program in Minnesota because, as he said:

It offers the greatest opportunity the State of Minnesota ever had to assist its farm population.

All of Olson's recommendations were not carried out, but sufficient legislation was passed so that Minnesota farmers were able to avail themselves of much of the benefit of the Federal rural electrification program.

More than any other person, Floyd Olson is responsible for the Federal Government's seed and feed loan policy to the farmers, having personally intervened to bring about that program.

On the whole, however, the farmer's problems, being national in scope, must be solved by national rather than by State action. Floyd Olson and the Farmer-Labor Party

carried this fight for the farmer to the Halls of Congress, a fight which is still being carried on.

PIONEERED FOR YOUTH

Minnesota's illustrious Floyd pioneered in all phases of social legislation, but in none was his trail more blazing or more worthy than in the field of youth aid. He was the first Governor in America to consider the effects of the depression upon youth and really do something about it.

If I were asked—

Said Governor Olson—

to name the greatest tragedy that has followed in the wake of the depression, I would say that it has been the destructive effect upon the morale of our youth. If I were asked to name the chief victim of the present heartless order I would not hesitate to say "youth."

Let us return for a moment to the early depression days, when families losing their homes could not afford to keep their children in school. Those were the days when thousands of our young men and women, boys and girls, were forced to take to the roads. Many persons undoubtedly have been startled by the conditions described in John Steinbeck's novel, *Grapes of Wrath*. Many think these conditions are new. They are not. They existed in a much more aggravated form in the early days of the depression. They were described in a book by Thomas Minehan, *Boy and Girl Tramps of America*. Mr. Minehan at that time was professor of sociology at the University of Minnesota; and in gathering material for his book he left the classroom and went out on the road himself, living with the so-called tramps. The conditions described in this book do not make pleasant reading, but I recommend a perusal of it to those who are not afraid to become acquainted with some naked truths.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

For the purpose of devising a practical program for youth, Governor Olson called a State-wide conference of educators in Minnesota in the spring of 1933. As a result of that conference the so-called Minnesota plan was formulated, "whereby worthy youths could receive aid from State and Federal relief funds for the furtherance of their education."

The plan called for contributions by the State and Federal Governments to provide for the employment of youths attending school. It was immediately placed in operation in Minnesota, and attracted so much favorable attention that in the early part of 1934 Harry Hopkins, then F. E. R. A. Administrator, adopted this form of student work relief.

Governor Olson in person presented the Minnesota plan at a White House conference; and in June 1935, when the President by Executive order established the National Youth Administration, the heart of it was student aid in the form of work relief as proposed by Governor Olson and put into operation in the State of Minnesota.

Floyd looked upon youth as the future hope of the Nation. Said he:

The Nation is crying for young men and women to lead it. Our opponents defend the system which crushes youth; we attack it. We need youth to help make over this sick and palsied structure in which we try to live into a better and finer social order.

EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS

As part of his program for youth, Governor Olson fought not only for preserving educational standards at a time when educational standards throughout the country were being lowered in the interest of economy, but for raising them. His reply to the campaign of the so-called taxpayers' leagues to cut down school expenditures was, "We need more education, not less." He observed that many of the schools in the poorer sections of the State were inferior to schools in the more well-to-do sections; that on the whole, rural schools were inferior to city schools; that rural districts could not afford to pay higher taxes to improve their schools; that higher taxes would drive the families off the land; and that many rural children, particularly those in the high-school grades, could not attend school because of transportation costs.

As a result of his efforts, the amount of State aid to schools was virtually doubled during Governor Olson's administration; a State income tax was passed, and mining company taxes raised, the major share of which went to equalizing education; a series of "school aids for transportation" were put through, providing for free transportation of rural high-school students and transportation of crippled children to school; and a bill was passed providing aid for special schools for crippled children.

Olson also aided education by successfully opposing the cutting of teachers' salaries, by strengthening laws relating to teachers' tenure, and by conducting one of the leading fights in the country for academic freedom in our schools and colleges.

TRUE FUNCTIONS OF EDUCATION

The true function of education—

Wrote the Governor in an article for a local parent-teacher publication—

is to show the way to life—to teach us to live. To accomplish this purpose, there must be complete academic freedom, not only for university professors and instructors, but, even more so, for the teachers in our elementary schools. We cannot hide the truth from our children and expect them to grow into manhood and womanhood with clear eyes and with clear brains.

The real teacher must possess a state of mind akin to the scientist—and that state of mind must be imparted to the pupil. That is the laboratory state of mind. It is a state of mind that is open to the truth, no matter where the truth may lead, and ever ready to embrace the truth, once it is definitely identified. All study must be motivated by the quest for truth.

I am not attempting moral generalizations. I am thinking in positive and concrete terms. I mean that when teachers indulge in distortions of the truth because of economic self-interest they defile their classrooms. The products of such classrooms, then, are young folks who enter into life with perverted ideas—young people incapable both of analyzing the weighty problems of today and of finding the remedy for these problems.

Give this country one generation taught to seek the truth, a generation unafraid to follow the truth after it is found, and I am satisfied that economic and social problems which seem so knotty today will become quite simple of solution. Such a generation will teach us to live and obtain for us the full measure of the richness of life.

PENSIONS—NOT CHARITY TO AGED

As Olson sought to give youth greater opportunity, a better chance to find itself, so also did he seek to bring security to the aged. Here, also, he was carrying out the philosophy of the Farmer-Labor Party.

From the very beginning, the Farmer-Labor Party campaigned for adequate old-age pensions. It took the position that the aged were entitled to such pensions not as a matter of charity but as a matter of right—something which society owes to those who devote their lives to contributing to our social wealth, and who, in the sunset of their lives, find themselves in want. A life entirely free from want, a life of ease and comfort, is the least we must assure to the aged. It is to the everlasting disgrace of this rich country that it has not as yet done this.

During his first term of office, the Governor pleaded with the legislature to adopt a State-wide compulsory old-age pension plan, but it was rejected. However, he kept up his fight, and in 1933 a State-wide compulsory old-age pension law was placed upon the statute books.

In the face of conservative pressure to weaken the act, Governor Olson succeeded, in the 1935 legislative session, in putting through features to liberalize it, although not all of his recommendations as to amounts paid, age limits, and length of residence were adopted.

FIGHT FOR ADEQUATE RELIEF

Floyd Olson's humanitarian principles and ideals came to the fore most strikingly when he made his outstanding fight for adequate appropriations for the State's needy during the desperate winter of 1933. That fight focused national attention upon Minnesota.

It was a situation which required drastic measures to meet a drastic situation, and Olson took such drastic measures. A preponderantly conservative State senate, with extreme bitterness and tenacity, opposed Governor Olson's relief

program. Addressing a group of relief marchers on the State capitol, the Governor served this warning upon those who were more concerned with saving a few dollars in taxes for the mining companies and the utilities than they were with the fact that people were faced with the problem of not having anything to eat:

I am making a last appeal to the legislature. I want to say to the people of the State of Minnesota that if the legislature—the senate in particular—does not make ample provision for the sufferers in the State who through no fault of their own are in that condition, and if the Federal Government refuses to aid, as it properly may, because of refusal of the State legislature to handle the situation, and the communities become unable to take care of the people, I shall invoke the powers that I hold, and I shall declare martial law.

A lot of people who are now fighting the measure because they happen to possess considerable wealth will be brought in by provost guard and be obliged to give up more money than they would now. As long as I sit in the governor's chair there is not going to be any misery in the State if I can humanly prevent it.

STARTLED THE NATION

Never before had a Governor in the United States proposed martial law during an economic depression in order to see that the hungry were fed. The Tory press in Minnesota and throughout the entire country vigorously denounced Olson. Olson replied in a radio address:

Only a few years ago we engaged in a great World War. The total cost of the war to the United States is estimated to be approximately \$44,000,000,000. If this were allotted among the States it would amount to almost a billion dollars for each State. During the war we made no objection to the appropriation of money to insure victory.

We are now engaged in a great war against poverty and distress, in which the fundamentals involved are a hundredfold greater than the issues involved in the World War. For fighting, killing, and destroying life and property there is plenty of money, but for relieving the misery and starvation of our citizens the appropriations are negligible. Are we so miserly and so lacking in an understanding of our obligations to our fellow citizens who are in need that we must refuse the performance of our plain duty?

Olson refused to compromise, and he won a complete victory. The relief bill—which included also relief for drought-stricken farmers—was passed in its entirety. There were no bread lines or soup kitchens in Minnesota that winter. Neither was it necessary for Governor Olson to call out the troops.

In Minnesota the State executive council had power to extend relief to persons suffering only by reason of action of the elements. Floyd Olson secured a change in the law to empower the council to extend relief to persons suffering by reason of economic causes beyond their control. This was an advance step, since in effect it was recognition on the part of the State of an obligation to relieve suffering caused by economic depressions.

DECREASED HOMESTEAD TAXES

Minnesota under Governor Olson assumed national leadership in the campaign for a tax system based upon ability to pay.

In an effort to shift the cost of government from those least able to pay to those best able to pay, Olson obtained passage of an income-tax law, which was a cardinal plank in the Farmer-Labor Party program, for which progressives and liberals of the State had unsuccessfully campaigned for 35 years.

Olson regarded a tax system under which most of the money is raised through a tax upon real property, commonly known as the general property tax, as obsolete, economically unsound, and morally unjust. He said:

With practically every civilized nation on the globe having discarded the system, predatory wealth in America, which sees in the income tax an obstacle to continued concentration of wealth, has been able to retain the general property tax as the basic principle and cornerstone of our tax structure. A government that blindly continues to make those who can least afford to pay bear the brunt of the burden is building a house of glass and laying a foundation in quicksand. Of course, there is no reason why successful incomes should not support the government that makes these incomes possible.

The first homestead tax law in the United States lowering the tax rate on small homes and moderate farms was enacted

under Governor Olson. The Farmer-Labor Party had always contended for preferential tax treatment.

In the growth of chains and monopolies Olson saw the greatest threat to the average citizen seeking a career in business. To protect the independent merchant against unfair chain-store competition, he forced the passage—I use the word “forced” advisedly—of a graduated chain-store tax. The Farmer-Labor Party was the only political party in Minnesota which, by deeds rather than by words, did something to protect the independent businessman.

VETOES SALES TAX

Thanks to Floyd Olson, the sales tax—the tax on poverty—never came to Minnesota. Not that there was not a determined effort to bring it there. There was, but it did not succeed.

In 1935 a reactionary legislature passed what was known as an omnibus tax bill, the principal feature of which was a general sales tax. By the device of incorporating the sales-tax feature in the omnibus bill, sales-tax proponents went on the theory that the Governor would be compelled to accept it, since the entire bill had to be either accepted or rejected. But they did not correctly estimate the courage of Floyd Olson. His warnings that he would veto the bill if the sales-tax provision were included went unheeded. But Governor Olson did veto it and the opposition did not even attempt to pass the bill over his veto. They were stunned. Opposition in Minnesota to a sales tax has since frustrated every conservative effort to force such a tax on the people.

The Olson administration also conducted a very vigorous campaign against the wealthy tax dodger, and millions of dollars' worth of carefully concealed wealth which had theretofore escaped taxation was uncovered.

CONSERVATION OF STATE RESOURCES

The story of the dissipation of Minnesota's natural resources constitutes one of the darkest chapters in the history of our State. The magnificent forests of white and Norway pine were turned over to the timber barons for looting; private capitalists, mostly from the East, were given almost carte blanche authority to exploit the State's iron-ore resources, the richest deposit of this valuable mineral in the world; the State's principal power sites were surrendered to the Power Trust.

With Governor Olson and the Farmer-Labor Party in power, there came an end to this era of squander of the natural resources of the State. All conservation activities were coordinated and placed under one head, and a far-reaching, comprehensive policy for conserving and restoring, so far as possible, these natural resources and utilizing them in the interest of all the people was put into effect.

Governor Olson believed, as he stated in his second inaugural message to the legislature, that conservation, “above all, should be concerned with human values,” and that “if it fails to do that, then conservation is mere sentiment—a beautiful sentiment but of no social significance.”

Achievements in conservation under Governor Olson are too great to be recounted here. I shall cite but a few.

When he took office in 1931 the State did not have even a semblance of a forest policy. Under his administration, a forest policy looking far into the future was put into effect. An aimless policy of forest annihilation was replaced by a policy of selective cutting of timber on State-owned lands, assuring against timber cutting greater than its replacement by Nature; the area of legally established State forests was increased from 35,000 acres to more than 4,000,000 acres, and a reforestation program put into effect. Not a single foot of virgin timber belonging to the State was cut down during the entire 6 years of his administration.

Governor Olson gave the State its first scientific program for park development through creation of a special division of parks within the department of conservation; he gave the State one of the most ambitious programs for water conservation in the country; and he converted the division of game and fish from a political dumping ground to a meritorious service.

LAND-UTILIZATION POLICY

A conservation achievement of Governor Olson which will become more important with the passing of time was his appointment of a land-utilization committee, headed by the late Dr. Coffman, president of the University of Minnesota. This committee also included the director of the Lake States Forest Experiment Station, one of the most noted authorities in the country on matters of conservation. The purpose of the committee was to make a study of land use to lay the foundations for a future scientific land-use policy for the State.

The committee undertook a study of this most important subject and submitted a report that undoubtedly will become a blueprint for the ultimate formulation of a land-use policy. When this is done it will prevent recurrence of many of the tragic episodes of the past brought about through haphazard land use and settlement—use of land for purposes not intended by nature. Minnesota knows the meaning of such tragedies, particularly its experience with a land-shark boom, when water was drained away from swamp peat land in the northern part of the State and sold as good farming land—leaving a trail of blasted hopes, broken homes, and bankrupt communities in its wake.

I have cited some of the accomplishments of the Olson administration. I could easily cite many more. I could cite the abolition of the silence system at the State penitentiary and the practice of handcuffing prisoners to their cell doors; general improvement of all State institutions in methods of management as well as physical improvement; humane treatment of the unfortunate wards of the State; passage of legislation granting pensions to the blind and pensions to dependent children; legal regulation of the sale of State timber that broke up the monopoly held by the powerful timber interests.

FARMER-LABOR PROGRAM

The complete Farmer-Labor program was not realized. This could only have been realized with the aid of a State legislature sympathetic to that program. The last legislature under Governor Olson defeated his proposals for maternity, health, and accident insurance; for additional rural electrification enabling legislation to give the farmers the full benefits of the Federal program; for State aid to schools in full; tenure for rural school teachers; further increases in the chain-store tax; amendments to strengthen the mortgage-moratorium law; safety regulation for railway employees; outlawing of loan-shark corporations; the 48-hour week for women; reduction of legal interest rates; making workmen's compensation insurance compulsory; tax delinquency collection on large business properties; prohibition of deficiency judgments on farm and home debt, and other advanced social legislation.

The single great achievement of Floyd B. Olson and the Farmer-Labor Party, however, was that it proved that liberal, democratic government can be made to serve "in the interests of the common happiness of the people."

NATIONAL LEADERSHIP

By the close of 1935 the liberal movement, developing political consciousness in America, began to look to this dynamic figure in the Northwest for national leadership. It also looked to the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party as the springboard for the launching of a political movement of its own.

Governor Olson visioned the formation of a national Farmer-Labor Party. He knew that a political movement confined to State lines could never be an end in itself but only a means to an end, that, in fact, relatively little can be accomplished by a State party to bring about solution of fundamental social and economic problems.

This great Farmer-Labor leader knew also that neither of the old parties could be entrusted with the job of carrying out the liberal program. He knew that, while the liberals in one of the old parties may gain the ascendancy, it would be but temporary and that powerful reactionary forces still remaining within the party were certain to hold back and

hamper the carrying out of the program. Such has always been the case in the past. Neither of the old parties can be depended upon to support genuine liberal leadership over any sustained period.

THIRD PARTY MUST ARISE

Writing in Common Sense magazine in April 1935, on My Political Creed, Olson said:

A third party must arise. * * * The platform of the third party must be based upon this vital economic issue. It must demand the taking of any and all steps necessary to guarantee human liberties and a decent standard of living. It must have a humane concept based upon the rights of the people to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." It must educate people to a realization that government is but an instrument for the attainment of their inalienable rights.

Liberals in the East, weighing the chances of formation of a national political party, invited Floyd Olson to address them in New York. They wanted to look over the man whom liberals throughout the country were talking so much about. Olson appeared, and in a plea for the need of a national third party over a Nation-wide radio network on November 15, 1935, told the liberals of America:

For the third time in American history, America stands at the crossroads, facing a crisis.

The first time was when we had to decide whether this country was to remain a vassal colony of the Old World or to become a free nation. We had then, and have now, those who warned against the change—some because they were just timid souls and others because the status quo served their own selfish interests.

The second crisis was when we had to make a decision whether this Nation was to remain half slave and half free, or whether we would, theoretically at least, liberate all those in bondage.

So today we are again standing at the crossroads, forced to make a decision even more momentous—one which will test severely our courage and our wisdom.

In a sense, the crisis which we face is a world rather than an American crisis, but we will have to deal with it in an American way. Want in the midst of plenty has no scientific basis for justification. Production and distribution of wealth are social functions.

In the cities and on the farms millions of individuals have been compelled to eke out a mere existence in the obscurity of dark slums and unsanitary farm shacks. From the standpoint of the industrialist these slums were highly desirable; they served to provide large quantities of cheap labor. And when crime and degeneracy worked their way into society, instead of seeking to relieve causes we dealt harshly with the malefactors assuring ourselves, smugly and righteously, that society was being protected. We mistook the symptoms for the disease and bungled the cure.

The Government has poured billions of dollars into the economic stream, but even this vast sum has failed to improve the lot of the common man, although big business has been enjoying handsome profits. In a period of rising commodity prices, money wages have remained either stationary or have decreased. This means that real wages—the standard of living—have been going steadily down even though a considerably larger part of the population is living on a bare subsistence level. This is an inevitable result of an economy of false scarcity. When an economy, presumably of plenty, is so artificially stimulated as to bring about a price rise without creating distribution facilities which will permit satisfying the true demand, the forces of progress and of production are withheld from the masses.

A new system based upon a production to meet need must be set up. Its creation will be ruthlessly opposed. Only Government can set up a new economic system.

We can expect only reaction from one of the old political parties and sincere but ineffectual reform from the other. The only way lies in a third party preaching an economy of abundance and production for use instead of for profit, with an opportunity for work and a decent standard of living.

The road is clear if we but have the courage to venture forth. Why fear to leave the darkness—to go forth into the sun? We are building for the future. Our ranks are thin and we need recruits, but we need no mercenaries. We need men and women of vision, of courage, of idealism, who will join us in the most inspiring crusade that anybody can partake in—the task of making this a country where life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is a reality and not an empty phrase.

ACCLAIMED BY LIBERALS

While the conservatives of the Nation bitterly criticized Governor Olson for this address the liberals acclaimed him. It was obvious to them why Minnesota, under his leadership, had become the spearhead of the entire progressive movement of the country. And as the liberals of Minnesota had placed this champion of human rights and of the underprivileged at the helm of their State movement so were the

liberals of America preparing to place him at the helm of a new national political movement.

But, stirring as was Floyd Olson's appeal, the liberals of the East on that occasion did not see the real Olson—the man who fired his audiences with his eloquence, the man who was able to instill, by the force of his magnetic personality, in others the same crusading spirit that he himself possessed. They saw an Olson whose body had already been ravished by a disease for which science has not as yet found an effective cure. His cheeks were hollow, his eyes sunken. There were telltale lines on his features. Little did that group realize that they had gathered to listen to what was in reality a departing message from this great man—a message to carry on without him. But it was a message of hope that he gave them; he painted not the sunset but the sunrise of a new and better day.

PRESERVING SPIRIT

Seldon Rodman, an eastern journalist who had known Olson and had seen him just 2 months previously, did notice that a change had come over him. Wrote Rodman after Olson's death:

He was entering the national political picture for the first time, pleading eloquently for a national Farmer-Labor Party. There were little lines around his eyes that afternoon and he looked older somehow. He spoke effectively in the evening, but without the thunder and lightning that used to bring the most bitten audiences of independent farmers to their feet as a single man.

After the meeting a few of us took him to a late show, trying to cheer him up, he looked so tired. At the table there, or dancing, he was conspicuous. People didn't know who he was but they sensed that he was "somebody." For even then with fatal sickness creeping over him, he radiated a graceful power, a magnetic fellowship that was irresistible. There were no tables when we came in—but the waiter took a look at Floyd and found one. He looked about him slowly, obviously a stranger here, yet at home. And people who saw him that night must have wished, as we were wishing, that they could see him again soon. Unlike us, though they could not have been aware that this was but a breath-taking before an important engagement, a rest after a very minor skirmish, another pause before a battle in which he was bound to play a leading, if not a decisive, role.

And today that battle is nearer than before. The forces are gathering, now deflected by false prophets, now rallied, now re-assembling where the rank and file sense the worthiness of the issue and a glorious outcome; still unprepared, now confident, now hesitating, ready.

But Floyd Olson is dead.

FARMER-LABOR CONVENTION SPEECH

It was but a matter of weeks after Olson returned to his home State that he was taken to the Mayo clinic at Rochester for an exploratory operation. It was the beginning of a gallant battle for life which his physicians said they never before had witnessed for its display of courage and consideration for those who attended him.

He was, however, to make two more important addresses before he passed on.

One of Olson's greatest speeches was his last before a Farmer-Labor convention, which met in the St. Paul Auditorium on March 27, 1936. This was on the eve of his intended campaign for the United States Senate.

Only his doctors and a few of his most intimate friends knew of his true condition. He spoke for nearly 2 hours, keeping the audience spellbound all the time, carrying on only by an indomitable will which did not know the meaning of the word "surrender."

CREDITED PARTY FOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Olson in that speech spoke of the accomplishments of his 6 years of office as accomplishments of the Farmer-Labor movement, rather than as accomplishments of his administration. He claimed the credit for his party—not for himself. The following paragraph is typical:

I cite you the fact that this movement (the Farmer-Labor movement) sponsored and brought about the passage of the first compulsory old-age pension law; that this movement has always stood upon the principle of taxation based upon ability to pay. I cite you the fact that despite years of struggle in this State to bring about the passage of an income-tax law—it was not until the Farmer-Labor movement gained control of the executive branch of the government and the Farmer-Labor movement enlisted the aid of popular opinion and public sentiment—not until then, despite all those years of struggle—was there an income-tax law in the State of Minnesota.

Floyd Olson opposed giving to the United States Supreme Court power to veto acts passed by the Congress for the social and economic welfare of the people. He had campaigned on that issue with "Fighting" Bob La Follette in 1924.

There is no living being who can place a law affecting social and economic change alongside the Constitution and find any definite statement in the Constitution authorizing or forbidding that law—he told the convention.

INTERPRETATION OF LAW

He continued:

The phrase "necessary and proper" means to the reading judge what he thinks it ought to mean in the light of his own viewpoint of life and of social and economic conditions. So with "due process of law." What is "property"? What emphasis should be laid upon the "property" in the Constitution when property rights come into conflict with the rights of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"? Which is the end to be attained in our Government—life and liberty, or property? Is "property" a means to the end that we may have "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," or is it an end in itself in which "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" must yield? What is a "person"? The Court says it includes corporations, but the Constitution does not so state.

When a judge undertakes to interpret words of general import in the Constitution, can he do other than interpret them in the light of his own convictions and his own experiences? If he be conservative in thought, he will interpret the Constitution from a conservative social and economic viewpoint. If we examine the decisions of the Supreme Court, we find conclusively that it has interpreted legislation, State and National, not only with a conservative viewpoint but with a conservative bias.

These interpretations of law, Olson insisted, in effect constituted lawmaking, a power which he said the courts were usurping. "They read in the Sherman Act," he said by way of illustration, "an interpretation that labor unions engaged collectively in a strike were operating in restraint of trade and in violation of the Sherman antitrust law." Of course, we here in Congress—at least most of us—know that the Sherman Act was never intended to be used against labor unions.

As a remedy Olson advocated not an enlarged Court but rather an amendment to the Constitution to—

Provided that members of the Supreme Court of the United States and its inferior courts shall hold office for a period not to exceed 10 years, and that they shall continue to be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

In other words, he wanted to limit their tenure of office to prevent the judiciary from becoming a permanent obstacle in the road of progress.

LAST PUBLIC ADDRESS

Olson's last speech and his last public appearance were on June 28, 1936, at the Swedish Day fete at Minnehaha Falls, "Laughing Waters," immortalized in verse by the famous American poet, Longfellow.

It was on a hot summer's day, and more than a hundred thousand persons turned out at the celebration to do honor to their Viking ancestors and reflect on the many and substantial contributions that they made to the onward march of civilization. With the spectacle of what is transpiring in Europe today, one feels chary about the use of the word "civilization"; but I am confident that this is but a dark chapter in the history of the human race, and that many bright chapters are to follow. Virtually all conflicts, whether they be of nations, of races, or of classes, have their origins in social and economic injustices. When these injustices disappear these struggles also are certain to disappear and we will then have found the solution to the problem of war. That was Floyd Olson's philosophy; and it is today and always has been the philosophy of the Farmer-Labor Party.

Olson came to that meeting of Scandinavian Americans against the advice of his physicians. He was thin, wan, pale, but his eyes still flashed, concealing to some extent his real physical condition.

He spoke for more than 30 minutes. His voice was somewhat weaker than usual, but it still contained much of its fire and its charm. Holding onto the rostrum of an improvised platform because of physical weakness, he yet maintained his superb platform poise. He spoke to an audience representing persons of all shades of social and political opinion, and he kept them spellbound. It was one of his

extemporaneous addresses, in which he was always at his best, but the context of which is preserved only in the minds of the men and women who heard him, and in the incomplete excerpts of his speech contained in the newspaper accounts of the celebration.

STATESMAN ELOQUENT

Recalling proudly his own Scandinavian ancestry, he told of the material and spiritual contributions of these sturdy pioneers to the well-being of democratic America, particularly the part they played in shaping and developing the great Northwest, the very cradle of modern-day American democracy.

Then, in a manner characteristic of Floyd B. Olson, his right hand held out and his forefinger pointing, he hurled a challenge at all smug, self-satisfied Americans, a challenge to the American rugged individualists, to look beyond the seas to tiny Scandinavia to learn how a peace-loving, industrious people, possessed of lofty social ideals and an abiding faith in the democratic way of life, have been able to achieve a high standard of living with almost infinitesimal resources when contrasted to the bounties which Nature bestowed upon this country. His plea was for a social order in which man's inhumanity to man would be replaced by man's consideration for man, and in which the supreme goal of society would be the attainment of happiness for all the people, the goal of the founding fathers.

That speech sapped every ounce of strength from his once-powerful frame. He faltered as he left the platform, and started to make his way toward his waiting automobile, in which sat Harry Hopkins, who had come to Minnesota to discuss matters of mutual W. P. A. interest with Olson. But things grew dark before his eyes, and the automobile seemed very, very far off. He would have collapsed had he not motioned to a friend and received assistance. Nobody in the vast audience knew, or even suspected, what had happened, and the fete program went on uninterrupted, as Olson wished. He would not permit his near collapse to mar the celebration.

A GREAT MAN PASSES

Shortly thereafter Floyd Olson was taken to Rochester, where he died on August 22, 1936, at the age of 44 years 9 months and 9 days—an age when most men are just starting out on their careers. He left a widow, Mrs. Ada Olson; a daughter, Patricia; his aged parents, now dead; and the common people of Minnesota and of America to mourn their loss.

Until the very last day Olson, who must have known of the serious nature of his illness, did not give up hope of getting into the coming political fight. The idea of quitting just was not in him. All his life, obstacles were merely things in the way to be overcome. That was part of life. But when all physical resistance had vanished, when he finally saw the image of the Grim Reaper, when he realized that there was one obstacle that could not be overcome, he called to his nurse and said:

This has got me. Don't worry; it must be all for the best.

And so he passed on, a thoroughbred.

TRIBUTE TO A FALLEN LEADER

At his funeral, tens of thousands gathered for the services in the Minneapolis Auditorium—the largest and most impressive funeral which Minnesota had ever given a man in either public or private life. Two hundred thousand people lined the streets and followed the hearse to the grave.

The rich and poor alike gathered—the poor to pay their last tribute to their friend and champion; the rich to pay their respects to a man who played the game hard but fair. A great American had passed on.

Thus fate snatched this leader of the common people as he was about to ascend the threshold to carry on the battle for them on the national scene.

GREATNESS RECOGNIZED

Said the St. Paul Daily News, at no time a supporter of the Olson administration:

Floyd Olson died on the threshold to greater things. A seat in the United States Senate was just a step away. The Presidency of the United States was a possibility.

In the event that he had achieved either, history would have recorded him, we believe, as among the great Americans. The idealistic policies he advanced will be accepted as commonplace in the next 10 years.

The cause of progress and liberalism has received a heavy blow in his death. There are other leaders, perhaps, who saw as he saw. There are advanced thinkers, no doubt, who can carry on from the point where Floyd Olson, because of his tragic death, left off. We know of none, however, who has the Olson combination of brains, humanity, personality, and energy—a combination necessary to the accomplishment of radical and essential changes in a society shown, during the past generation, to be sadly out of gear.

And the Minneapolis Star commented editorially:

Floyd B. Olson, a friend of man, is dead. Minnesotans, without respect to political persuasion, race, or creed, sorrow at the taking away of their brilliant Governor in the midst of a career that held so much promise.

Minnesotans all sorrow at the death of Floyd Olson. But to the man who struggles for a livelihood, the man who works and earns by the sweat of his brow, in shop or on farm, his passing is particularly and deeply poignant.

Possessing those rare qualities that go into the making of a champion of men, Floyd Olson, on a thousand platforms, in countless forums, fought tirelessly for the people as he understood their cause.

The future alone must determine whether the philosophy this man advocated in his pleadings is wise. He did venture far into untried fields of economics in his theories. And in administration he utilized methods that called upon him severest criticism. How much of it was just, it is not the place here to say.

But that the man was ardent in his efforts for equality, there can be no doubt. Appraisal of his theories and methods must await the perspective of years. The man was magnificent even to those who thought him wrong.

EULOGIES OF THE LIBERAL PRESS

Said Common Sense magazine:

If he had been only a prolabor Governor, Floyd Olson would have had neither the support he consistently won nor the place in American history which future progressives will give him. He was far more than that. For Floyd Olson was the first major political figure in our history to recognize the economic problem in its essence and espouse its solution.

The Journal of Electrical Workers and Operators credited Olson with elucidating "a labor philosophy more convincingly than any other man on the platform."

The Minneapolis Labor Review gave expression to the grief that had fallen upon the hundreds of thousands of Floyd Olson's followers in Minnesota when word of his death was received. Said the Labor Review:

The great heart that beat for the oppressed is stopped forever; his smile that shone through all the baseness of slander and abuse radiates no more.

Minnesota bows in sorrow at the grave of its noblest son. Floyd is gone, and among the farmers and city workers there is a loneliness and a sadness.

And yet that big hand that seemed always on our shoulders giving us confidence and courage, the kind hand of the courageous Viking, though he is dead we still can feel it. But, too, there is a void so great that all the millions of tears that are being shed will never fill it.

He will not lead us into the cooperative commonwealth, and yet no man ever did more to make the road clear, and to give us the courage to make the march and overcome whatever obstacles may beset.

It was for that Floyd Olson lived. It was for that he died. Shall we contend for less?

A MAN OF THE PEOPLE

How far would Floyd Olson have gone up the national ladder of fame had fate decreed for him a longer span of life? There is no telling. Possessing in abundance those sterling qualities of leadership that put men on top, it is almost certain that the liberals of America would have selected him as the standard bearer of a new liberal political movement.

Olson thought in terms of service to his fellow man. Gold had no lure for him. The powers that he could never purchase his soul; it belonged to the people.

An intimate of Olson's provides the following glimpse of this side of his character:

We were coming home from a political meeting at Duluth a few years ago. It had been a great meeting, and the Skipper—

He was known among his close friends and associates as the Skipper—

made a particularly inspiring talk. We fell to musing, talking about why so many men, when they reach the position where they can really give the masses more than lip service, sell out. They say that every man has his price, and those who seek to bribe our public officials certainly have whatever is necessary to pay.

"I am not afraid of that"—

Olson commented.

"They can take me to the top of the mountain and show me the Promised Land; they can show me the valleys below with their fabulous stores of hidden riches; but I am certain they will never get me. I haven't sufficient love of money—I do not crave gold."

Anybody who is at all familiar with the recent history of Minnesota and the history of the Farmer-Labor Party knows of the determined efforts that were made to buy Floyd Olson; and they know that when these efforts failed—when those making them discovered that here was a man who had no price—they sought to destroy him by every means at their command, fair or foul. There was no weapon too mean, no tactic too vile for them to employ. But they did not succeed. He was more than a match for them.

PLACE IN HISTORY

Floyd Olson earned for himself an important place in American history. With the passing of years his receding figure will loom larger on the horizon of time, and some day his name will become a symbol in this country of the struggle of the masses for social and economic justice.

Said Wisconsin's Phil La Follette, in his oration at Olson's funeral:

He recognized that for unnumbered centuries the human race lived in a world which could not produce enough food and shelter to provide for the human family. It was an age when progress was advanced by individual explorers constantly in search of new lands, new inventions, and new methods for increasing our material resources. It was a period when the common welfare was promoted by individualistic activity.

Within Governor Olson's generation all of this untold individual effort produced the machine age and mass production.

The human family for the first time in its history lived in a world that could produce more than enough for all. Floyd Olson understood this basic change from an age of scarcity to an age of plenty. He understood that the social usefulness of selfish individualism was ended. He saw that there must be a new spirit of cooperation if this great power of production were to serve the common welfare. Floyd Olson and the movement of which he was the leader aligned themselves with this great current of change—a change going on throughout the world. He supplied the function of leadership by giving constructive direction to the force of change in the period in which he lived.

A COURSE FOR A NATION TO FOLLOW

Olson exemplified a life of love, not hatred, of human beings. He fought what he regarded as the evils of a system, and all those who stood in the way of bringing about a better social order. But he was not interested—nor is the party he represented—in taking away any of the good things in life from anybody. He was interested—and so is his party—in bringing the good things of life to everybody who, by hand or brain, contribute to our social wealth.

He realized that a State government of itself could do very little toward raising the living standard of the people. What it could do was to be a pioneer in the field of social legislation and fix a course for the Nation to follow.

To my mind the greatest service Floyd Olson and his party rendered America was a demonstration that democracy in this country can be made to serve the interests of all our citizens rather than the interests of a privileged few. And if democracy is to survive, that is what it must do. When our democracy is able to supply our people with security and a decent standard of living it will have become something worth fighting for—and no outside force, no matter how powerful, will be able to threaten it. To that end we must mold our Government.

Floyd Olson thus had a profound effect on his time. He had a profound effect upon America. And, as the things he stood for—the things that the Farmer-Labor Party stands for today—become better understood, they are certain to play an even more important part in shaping the future course of our people for a fuller and better life.

VICTORY AHEAD

Floyd Olson kept faith with the common people of Minnesota and the liberals of America. The common people of Minnesota and the liberals of America will keep faith with him by carrying on the battle until victory is won. To that end this great American gave his life—and I am sure not in vain.

There may be dark days ahead. The storm clouds may gather. They always do. The thunder and lightning may drive some to cover. But ultimately the people's cause, sometimes retarded, will ride through the storm. In the end, the sun comes out. Victory comes to those who persevere.

Said Olson:

Human progress is sometimes arrested; the shackles are tightened on the common man. In these periods we despair; we lose faith in the human race having the stuff to create a better system, an ordered society founded on social and economic justice. But history shows that after periods of set-backs, we drive on again, recapture the ground we lost, and advance to new positions.

So I say to the progressives of America: Listen to the voice of Floyd B. Olson speaking to the progressives of his State in the campaign of 1932:

The Farmer-Labor Party presents a cause, yes, a crusade—a crusade for better government in the interests of the many, and to promote the happiness of the many. And, to use the inspiration of that immortal document, the Declaration of Independence: We of the Farmer-Labor Party invite all good citizens to help us; and to the support of the cause of human rights and equal justice we mutually pledge to each other and to you our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor. We, the people, have seen Floyd Olson rise to great heights championing the cause of labor, the poor, and the jobless. His unflinching courage remains with the party. We cherish his principles and carry on remembering that

... "When he fell. . . ."

He went down as when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky. . . ."

Upward and onward we progress to eventual victory—victory that comes to all true and honest causes.

Mr. President, I recount the life and struggles of Minnesota's first Farmer-Labor Governor. Here we have the creed, here we have the program, of a great and a mighty leader. Here we have the party and its platform which helped lift Minnesota to a higher and better plane of living. We have the program and plan and creed and solution which must come eventually to the United States someday; this program must be adopted before we can solve the great problems which now trouble our times.

THE BASIC ELEMENT OF AMERICAN LIFE

These problems will be solved when the great farm element of the United States, which, after all, is the basic element of all American life, the producers of agricultural products, and those who labor and toil in our factories join hands with the small independent businessmen and stand behind this creed. This program—the planks here outlined, which I have quoted—I wish to place in the RECORD so that those who may be interested in research may find inspiration for an advance into the struggle and the battle which is before us.

We cannot permit a situation in the United States to continue indefinitely in which more than 10,000,000 are out of work, a situation which led the President of the United States to state on the front steps of this great Capitol not so long ago that one-third of our people were ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clothed. Our problems must be solved. In God's good time they will be solved.

YOUTH AND THE FUTURE OF AMERICA

Mr. President, I am not a pessimist, I am an optimist; I believe in the future of this great country, no matter how many errors and mistakes we make or how we stumble along the dark road. If we cannot solve them, youth will come up the great, mighty road of American progress with the creed of Olson, with the creed of our party, and contribute to the greatness and glory of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted at the close of these remarks a bibliography of the writings and speeches of this great man and a chronology of his life. I thank the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON FLOYD B. OLSON

INAUGURAL MESSAGES

First inaugural message, January 7, 1931: McGrath and Delmont, *Floyd B. Olson, His Life and Speeches*, page 117.

Second inaugural message, January 4, 1933: McGrath and Delmont, *Floyd B. Olson, His Life and Speeches*, page 217.

Third inaugural message, January 9, 1935: McGrath and Delmont, *Floyd B. Olson, His Life and Speeches*, page 268.

SPECIAL MESSAGES

Special message to regular session of Minnesota State Legislature, February 25, 1933: Minnesota State Historical Library.

Message to the special session of the Minnesota State Legislature, December 6, 1933: McGrath and Delmont, *Floyd B. Olson, His Life and Speeches*, page 322.

Message to the 1935 special session of the Minnesota State Legislature, called to pass social-security legislation, December 3, 1935, McGrath and Delmont, *Floyd B. Olson, His Life and Speeches*, page 292.

LEGISLATIVE MESSAGES AND PROCLAMATIONS

Mortgage moratorium proclamation in Minnesota, February 24, 1933; McGrath and Delmont, *Floyd B. Olson, His Life and Speeches*, page 232.

Compulsory unemployment insurance, a speech in house chamber, February 25, 1933: Minnesota State Historical Society Library.

Martial-law proclamation during Minneapolis truckers' strike, July 26, 1934: McGrath & Delmont, *Floyd B. Olson, His Life and Speeches*, page 244.

Veto message on 1935 omnibus bill: Minnesota State Historical Library.

Armistice Day proclamation, November 11, 1933: McGrath & Delmont, *Floyd B. Olson, His Life and Speeches*, page 243.

FARMER-LABOR PARTY ADDRESSES

Farmer-Labor convention address, St. Paul Auditorium, March 27, 1932: Minnesota State Historical Library.

Farmer-Labor Association convention address, St. Paul Auditorium, March 20, 1932: Minnesota State Historical Library.

All-party dinner address, Radisson Hotel, Minneapolis, May 21, 1932: Minnesota State Historical Library.

Keynote address, St. Paul Auditorium, October 3, 1932: Minnesota State Historical Library.

Farmer-Labor Association convention address, St. Paul Auditorium, March 27, 1934: Minnesota State Historical Library.

Farmer-Labor dinner address, Jackson, Minn., October 12, 1934: Minnesota State Historical Library.

Farmer-Labor convention, last speech before a Farmer-Labor convention, St. Paul Auditorium, March 27, 1936: Minnesota State Historical Library; also McGrath & Delmont, page 297.

SPEECHES—RADIO AND GENERAL

The Farmer-Labor Party and Agriculture, radio address over WCCO, October 29, 1932: Minnesota State Historical Library.

Cases of Unemployment, radio address over WCCO, November 3, 1932.

Hormel strike, Governor addresses strikers, November 13, 1933, St. Paul Dispatch.

Truck Drivers' Strike Address over KSTP, August 27, 1934; Minnesota State Historical Library.

Youth, radio address over WCCO, September 27, 1934; Minnesota State Historical Library.

United States Supreme Court, an address: Extension of remarks by Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN in the Senate of the United States, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, volume 81, Appendix, pages 762-767.

WRITINGS

My Political Creed, Common Sense, April 1935

A National Third Party, the Farmer-Labor Challenge to Toryism, Common Sense, November 1933.

A Primer on Unemployment Insurance, and Questions and Answers on Unemployment Insurance Legislation, and Questions and Answers on the Unemployment Reserve Bill, prepared by Gov. Floyd B. Olson, St. Paul, 1934, 10 pages.

True Teaching—Purpose of Education, Minneapolis Parents and Teachers Association Publication, 1935.

NEWSPAPER COMMENT AND FEATURE ARTICLES

Martial Law for the Rich, Literary Digest, April 29, 1933.

State Press Versus the Hormel Strike, Minnesota Farmer-Labor Leader, November 3, 1933.

Report of an address made by Governor Olson, St. Paul Pioneer Press, December 22, 1933.

Injunction Denied in Truckers' Strike After Olson Appears in Court, Farmer-Labor Leader, August 15, 1934.

Presidential Timber, an interview with Paul Y. Anderson, Farmer-Labor Leader, August 30, 1934.

Olson and Youth, Detroit Lakes Record, October 5, 1934.

Governor Olson and Youth, Cook News Herald, October 5, 1934.

Line Between Police and Citizens Alliance, Journal of Electrical Workers and Operators, October 1934.

Old-Age Pensions, Minneapolis Tribune, March 21, 1935.

Sales Tax, St. Paul Dispatch, March 21, 1935.

A. F. of L. Endorses Olson, Minneapolis Star, August 21, 1935.

Flour City Strike, editorial in Pope County Tribune, October 4, 1935.

Strutwear strike articles: St. Paul Dispatch, January 25, 1936; Minneapolis Star, January 25, 1936; Minneapolis Journal, February 6, 1936; St. Paul News, February 7, 1936.

Olson Rebukes Federal Court for Criticism, Washington Post, February 8, 1936.

National Third Party, Minneapolis Journal, March 27, 1936.

Floyd B. Olson, editorial in Minneapolis Star, August 26, 1936.

Floyd B. Olson, editorial in St. Paul Daily News, August 26, 1936.

The Man Who Never Forgot, editorial, Minneapolis Labor Review, August 28, 1936.

Floyd, an editorial in Journal of Electrical Workers and Operations, September 1936.

Declares for a national third party and Federal ownership of business, speech to Minnesota Farmer-Labor convention, New York Times, March 28, 1936 (p. 2, ch. 2).

Feature article on leadership of third-party movement in Minnesota, New York Times, May 19, 1935 (sec. 7, p. 5).

Inaugural address, New York Times, January 8, 1931 (p. 41, ch. 3).

Speech at meeting of Great Lakes Harbor Association, warns of insurrection by farmers, New York Times, October 20, 1933 (p. 10, ch. 7).

Speech on Government aid to cooperatives; speech to third-party group, St. Paul, New York Times, December 9, 1934 (p. 36, ch. 1).

MAGAZINE ARTICLES

Embattled Governor. Literary Digest, 121:36, March 7, 1936.

Emergence of the North Star State; Heritage of Minnesota. Minnesota History, 14:165-71, June 1933.

Floyd Olson. Today, page 5, September 1936.

Floyd Olson: Forerunner. Nation, 143:230, August 29, 1936.

Gov. Floyd B. Olson: The Man and His Program. R. U. Swanson. American Swedish Monthly, pages 11-13, February 1935.

Governor of Minnesota. State Government, 9:105, May 1936.

Governor Olson, of Minnesota. J. O. Meyers. Nation, 133:593-40, November 18, 1931.

Governor Olson's last interview. C. R. Walker. Nation, 144:318-20, March 20, 1937.

Article by W. Davenport. Collier's, 94:12-13, September 8, 1934.

Article in Scholastic, 24:26, April 21, 1934.

Letter from Minnesota. S. Rodman. New Republic, 80:10-12, August 15, 1934.

Lightning on the Left, Scholastic, 28:21, December 7, 1935.

Minnesota Sets Some Precedents. A. Ross. New Republic, 80:121-3, September 12, 1934.

Minnesota Sets Some Precedents; Reply. H. Solow. New Republic, 81:20, November 14, 1934.

Minnesota's Enigma. J. Janney. American Mercury, 120:47+, September 1935.

Obituary. New Week, 8:40, August 29, 1936.

Article in Time, 28:13-14, August 31, 1936.

Floyd Bjornstjerne Olson, 1891-1936. Sketch. Commercial and Financial Chronicle, 143:1336, August 29, 1936.

Olson: Radical and Proud of It. H. Lefkowitz. Review of Reviews, 91:36-40+, May 1935.

Olson's Senate Problem. Literary Digest, 121:5-6, January 4, 1936.

Remarks in Senate relative to the election of Gov. Floyd B. Olson. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, volume 79, page 749.

Senator Pro Tempore. Time, 27:9-10, January 6, 1936.

Symposium of views of certain Governors relative to the St. Lawrence waterway. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-second Congress, second session, volume 75, pages 765-8. Hon. Floyd B. Olson, Governor of Minnesota, page 766.

Third-Party Advocate. Literary Digest, 120:39, November 30, 1935.

You Bet Your Life I'm a Radical. F. C. Kelly. Today, pages 8-9+, 8-9+, December 22-29, 1934.

Why a New National Third Party? Common Sense, April 1935.

Floyd Olson—a Tribute. Selden Rodman. Common Sense, September 1936.

BOOKS

John S. McGrath and James J. Delmont: Floyd Bjornstjerne Olson, Minnesota's Greatest Liberal Governor. A memorial volume, in honor of the late Governor of the State of Minnesota, 1930-36, the story of his life and many of his greatest speeches, St. Paul, McGrath and Delmont, 1937, 333 pages.

Farmer-Labor Party Speakers' Manual for 1932, 1934, and 1936 campaigns.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD REFERENCES

Floyd B. Olson: Hon. R. T. BUCKLER of Minnesota in the House of Representatives, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, volume 81, Appendix, pages 2563-2564.

Floyd B. Olson: Hon. Dewey W. Johnson in the House of Representatives, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, volume 81, Appendix, page 2244.

The United States Supreme Court address by Governor Olson, delivered before the Farmer-Labor convention at St. Paul, Minn., March 27, 1936. Hon. BURTON K. WHEELER in the United States Senate, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, volume 80, pages 7842-7844.

Message to Minnesota Legislature delivered December 3, 1935, by the late Governor Olson: Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN in the Senate of the United States, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, volume 81, Appendix, pages 762-767.

Floyd B. Olson, Governor of Minnesota: Inaugural message delivered January 7, 1931. Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN in the House of Representatives, Seventy-third Congress, first session, 1933, volume 77, page 4564.

Farmer-Labor Party: Remarks of Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN in the House of Representatives, Seventy-third Congress, first session, 1933, volume 77, page 4398.

A National Labor Party—Eventually, Why Not Now? Platforms and national parties. Remarks of Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-fourth Congress, 1935, volume 79, page 13516.

Third inaugural message and special message to the Legislature of Minnesota, January 9, 1935. Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN in the Senate of the United States, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-fifth Congress, 1937, volume 81, part 9, Appendix, page 762.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF FLOYD B. OLSON

November 13, 1891: Born in Minneapolis, Minn., the son of Norwegian and Swedish parents, Paul A. Olson and Ida Maria Nelson Olson.

1897-1905: Attended Grant and Logan grade schools.

1905-9: Attended and graduated from North High School, Minneapolis, Minn.

1909: Freight handler for Northern Pacific Railway.

Summer, 1910: Farm work in North Dakota.

1910-11: Attended the University of Minnesota.

Summer, 1911: Traveling salesman of farm machinery.

1911-14: Odd jobs; scowman on the Frazier River, silver mining in Canadian Rockies, and an attempt to strike gold in Alaska.

1914: Returned to Minneapolis and entered the law office of Frank D. Larrabee and Otto D. Davies, attending night classes of the Northwestern College of Law, Minneapolis, Minn.

1915: Graduated from the Northwestern College of Law, Minneapolis, as valedictorian of his class. Passed the State bar examination.

1918: Married Miss Ada A. Krejci, of New Prague, Minn. To them was born one child, Patricia.

1919: Appointed special assistant in the office of the county attorney of Hennepin County.

1920: Appointed county attorney by the county commissioners. Defeated for Democratic nomination for Congress in fifth district.

1922: Ran for election to position of county attorney and won by 70,938, the greatest plurality ever received for that office.

1924: Made his first run for Governor of Minnesota on the Farmer-Labor ticket and lost by only 40,000 votes.

1926: Reelected county attorney by 33,580 majority and led successful fight against municipal graft and corruption.

1930: Became the first Farmer-Labor Governor of the State and Nation, defeating his Republican opponent by a plurality of 183,626 votes. He held this position until his death.

1932: Second victory in election as Farmer-Labor Governor of the State of Minnesota by a majority of 188,357.

1934: Third victory in election as Farmer-Labor Governor of the State of Minnesota by a majority of 72,453.

1936: Nominated as Farmer-Labor candidate for the United States Senate, June 15, 1936, by an overwhelming majority of 161,700.

August 22, 1936: Death of Gov. Floyd B. Olson at Rochester, Minn.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 544) making appropriations for work relief and relief, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I make the point that there is not a quorum present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Donahey	Lodge	Sheppard
Andrews	Downey	Lucas	Shipstead
Ashurst	Ellender	Lundeen	Slaterry
Austin	George	McKellar	Smith
Bailey	Gerry	McNary	Stewart
Bankhead	Gillette	Maloney	Taft
Barkley	Green	Mead	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Guffey	Miller	Thomas, Okla.
Bone	Gurney	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Hale	Murray	Tobey
Brown	Harrison	Neely	Townsend
Bulow	Hatch	Norris	Truman
Burke	Hayden	Nye	Tydings
Byrnes	Herring	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Capper	Hill	Overton	Van Nuys
Caraway	Holman	Pepper	Wagner
Chandler	Holt	Pittman	Walsh
Chavez	Hughes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Johnson, Calif.	Reed	White
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	Wiley
Connally	King	Russell	
Danaher	La Follette	Schwartz	
Davis	Lee	Schwellenbach	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have been requested, but not ordered. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I simply wish to add a word or two to what was said by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The problem is rather plain and simple. In the effort to economize in the administration of the W. P. A. the appropriation, as recommended by the House committee, as recommended by the House, as recommended by the Senate committee, represents a very substantial reduction below the appropriation for similar purposes last year.

The joint resolution itself does not specify anything in reference to change in the location of offices. It is probably true, and I think the officials recognize, that if they are to administer the work within the limits of the funds which are provided in the measure, some means of economy, involving probably regionalization of some of the functions of the Treasury Department, will have to be agreed upon. If the present set-up of State offices is continued it will involve either consuming the appropriation considerably before the end of the year, or adding \$1,200,000 to the appropriation.

The Senator from Alabama very carefully pointed out from tables contained in the House hearings that some employees will necessarily be moved from certain States, to the regional offices, and that there will have to be some dismissals. I gathered from the Senator's remarks that he feels it would be improper economy to dismiss an employee, since such action might force the employee upon relief.

Personally it seems to me that the W. P. A. organization should be operated as economically as possible, and particularly in these days when such tremendous obligations are being imposed upon the Government for defense purposes.

We are simply confronted with this question: If we want to maintain State offices, if we want to maintain 700 employees who can be dispensed with, we should vote for the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. If we are willing to dispense with practically 750 employees in order to save the Government \$1,200,000, the answer is clear. That is the issue; on one side economy, as against placement and location on the other.

I think efficiency will not be substantially affected one way or the other. There will be a diminution in the number of employees in every State if the provisions which are now in the bill are adopted. It is a question whether or not we are willing to accede to a certain reduction in the personnel administering the functions which the Treasury Department performs for the W. P. A., and thus make a saving.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I dislike to disagree with the position taken on this question by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ADAMS], the chairman of the subcommittee, and I dislike to disagree with the majority of my colleagues on the committee about this or any other matter. I also certainly want the Government to be economical, and if I were at all assured that the proposed amendment would result in one-fifth of the saving which is claimed, I might be in favor of the committee provision, but I do not believe it will make any saving. I believe in the end it will cost more.

I have been a Member of the Senate for quite a long time, and have served on the Appropriations Committee for a number of years. I and other Senators have seen many representatives from various bureaus and departments come forward and say, "We would save a great amount of money by a consolidation here and a consolidation there and by removal of employees here and removal of employees there," but when the time comes for appropriations to be made for the

next year, the appropriations are usually increased instead of decreased.

What does the proposed appropriation do? At the present time there are procurement offices in the States. The States are reasonable subdivisions. They are natural subdivisions. They are the subdivisions of the Constitution. No one wants to abolish State lines. It would not be right or constitutional to do so. But what we do in effect by the provision in the bill, so far as this particular activity is concerned, is to abolish all State lines and establish 13 regions. What do we do? We transfer the purchasing of Government supplies for the W. P. A. from our own States to a State selected by the Department.

Mr. President, I cannot better express the situation than was expressed to me in a letter which I received from an honored constituent from Nashville, Tenn., and I shall read one paragraph of it:

It is apparent to us that the service should be kept open for the States and not regionalized. As you, of course, know, there are millions of dollars being spent annually for various kinds of materials, supplies, and merchandise through this office for the many activities of the Government in this State. Our merchants and contractors in Tennessee do not deserve and do not wish to have any advantages over the merchants and contractors of any other State, but they do want, and they emphasize that they be given an equal opportunity with other merchants and contractors, and it is our opinion that the way to insure an even distribution of these funds, which is certainly to be desired from the standpoint of the national good, is to insist that these offices remain on a State basis.

What could be a more natural position to take than that we should continue this work on a State basis?

This work has been in operation for 7 years. Seven years is a good long time. The organization has operated on a State basis for 7 years. Now, after 7 years the Bureau of the Budget comes forward with the regional plan of action.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that the testimony of the Treasury Department before the subcommittee clearly shows that this change is not instituted by the Treasury Department. They have been satisfied, and are still satisfied. The change was proposed at the suggestion of the Bureau of the Budget. Those who have been operating under the present system are satisfied with it, and are perfectly willing to keep it in operation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from Alabama. What he says is true. The Procurement Office, so far as I know, has not made a request that this change be made. The W. P. A. did not originate the proposal. It has been made by the Bureau of the Budget. I do not know what experience the change is based on. For 7 years we have been told that the way to purchase these supplies is through the various State offices. I think our experience is worth something. The W. P. A. has done a good job. The Procurement Office of the Treasury has done a good job. I think we ought not to go into an untried field. In other words, suppose there are \$2,000,000 of contracts to be let in the State of Colorado, and the Colorado State office is moved to Los Angeles, Calif. I do not remember whether or not it is proposed to be moved at all, but I am considering that it may be moved to Los Angeles, or to a nearer State.

It practically eliminates the contractors from bidding on those supplies. They must go to Los Angeles to bid. The contractors must take up the matter at Los Angeles. In other words, the purchase of those supplies would virtually be moved to California and would no longer exist in the State of Colorado.

A similar situation exists in Tennessee. Our contractors would have to go to Atlanta. I know nothing about the matter, and have never had anything to do with it. I do not know the man who purchases the supplies; but, as I understand, we have been purchasing supplies under the present system for 7 years. I have never heard of any friction over it or any claim that the system had not been honestly, fairly, and justly administered. I have never heard of the Procurement Office of the Treasury being criticized for what it has done during the past 7 years.

It is now proposed to change the system and consolidate it into 13 districts. The purchase of all the supplies for the W. P. A. is to be consolidated into 13 districts. I do not think such a plan is fair to the States. I do not think it is a good policy. We have regional offices in some other departments, but only here and there.

I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I wish to call two things to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee. Of course, no department ever originated any reduction in its own personnel. That is too obvious to deserve comment.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. That is just what I am complaining about. The purpose is not to lessen the number of personnel. The purpose is not economy. The number of employees will be as great as before. The only difference is that they will be consolidated in 13 States instead of 48.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the Senator stated that he did not believe there would be any economy. The economy is written into the joint resolution. Last year the Procurement Division had \$5,200,000. This year, under the joint resolution, it receives \$3,225,000. Last year the Division of Disbursements had \$2,500,000. The joint resolution provides \$1,724,000 for it. Last year the Office of Commissioner of Accounts and Deposits in the Division of Bookkeeping and Warrants had \$5,973,000, and the joint resolution provides \$3,827,000 for that office. In other words, under the terms of the joint resolution there is a positive reduction, a positive economy.

Mr. McKELLAR. The appropriation this year is about two-thirds of what it was last year. It is a little more than a fourth of what it was 3 or 4 years ago. The Senator does not give the relation of the figures. The appropriations this year are less than they were last year.

As I understand, the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma does not increase the appropriation. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to take the appropriation as it is in the joint resolution. I do not want to increase the appropriation; but the procurement of supplies ought not to be taken out of 48 States and put in the hands of the merchants of 13 States.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the procurement of supplies will not be taken from the States. That is not the provision.

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment, if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. ADAMS. May I read from the testimony?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Schoeneman, who is in charge of that matter, said:

Now, the regionalization in the case of procurement offices is not exactly comparable to the regionalization of offices of accounts and disbursements, because the Procurement Division has no intention of regionalizing all of its functions—merely its vouchering and administrative functions.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. ADAMS. There is a saving in that connection of about \$175,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator is entirely mistaken.

Mr. ADAMS. I am reading from the record.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not care what the Senator is reading from. Some of the State offices would be kept in each State, and that is why there would be no saving or economy. There would be these employees in addition to the big number in the regional office. Some sort of an office would be kept in each State, and that office would be permitted to purchase small amounts of supplies, probably not to exceed \$500. The State offices might be permitted to buy a few spools of cotton, a few picks and shovels, and perhaps a hoe occasionally. They might buy a few plows, but that is about all. Some sort of a State office will have to be retained to keep certain persons in office in the various States; but the large contracts will all be moved to the 13 great cities provided for in the joint resolution.

I am opposed to it. I do not think it ought to be done, and I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

I do not think we ought to obliterate State lines in this way. Why should we undertake, in a roundabout manner, to obliterate State lines? Why should we vote against our own States in favor of the 13 States favored by the Budget Director?

I like the Budget Director. He is a very fine man. I do not criticize him; but I do not think the Budget Director has authority to abolish State lines. So far as my vote is concerned, I will not vote to give him the authority to abolish State lines.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Who has a greater duty than Members of the Senate to protect the States? Senators represent their respective States. They ought to protect their States.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. I do not know about the relative duty; but so long as I am able to hold up my hand and have a place in this body I will stand by my State, and I will stand by the rights of all other States as well.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I trust the Senator may be spared many, many years, so that he may grace this body and hold up his hand and fight for his State.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator, and I join in that hope.

Mr. ADAMS. I am sure the people of Tennessee, in the coming November, will echo our hopes.

However, in this particular matter State lines are not necessarily involved. The Senator and I have repeatedly voted against proposals which have come from the other side of the aisle to reduce W. P. A. appropriation and management to State lines. We have taken the position that the obligation is national. We have declined to turn the control back to the States, and have repudiated the argument that we must not disregard State lines.

The purpose of this provision is to bring about economy. One result will be that some persons will lose their jobs if the economy is effected. Another result will be that some persons will be moved from where they now are. A third result will be that some persons will not be able to sell who now are able to sell. If the Senate wants to oppose the saving of \$1,200,000, of course, that is for the Senate to decide. The committee, with the exception of two of its most distinguished members, voted to make the saving, even though some employees in various States will lose their places.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I agree that the obligation to administer W. P. A. is national, and that we must treat it as national. However, the National Government has no right to destroy State lines. The Constitution under which we operate provides for States. It nowhere provides for regions. The word "region" does not appear in the Constitution.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, did the Senator vote for the Federal Reserve System?

Mr. McKELLAR. I did. That system is not in the Constitution, but it is an entirely different matter from the one here discussed. The purpose of the Federal Reserve System was to look after the currency and the money of the entire country, a constitutional requirement. It was not the purpose of the Federal Reserve System to affect the purchase of supplies in various States.

Mr. President, I want Senators to know what they are voting for when they vote against the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma. I take up the several regions.

Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont will turn over to Boston, Mass., the purchase of such goods, wares, and merchandise as may be sold to the United States Government.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that, in addition, all employees now in the Office of

Accounts and Deposits, as well as the Disbursement Division, will be moved out of the State.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, ostensibly or technically they may be moved out; but we know that persons who have lived in a State all their lives will not be moved out. The places will go to others, in the States in which the offices are established.

The second region, New York State, does not make any difference, because that is a district within itself.

What about the third district? Where is Delaware? Delaware and New Jersey will turn over to Philadelphia all the purchases which now take place in those States. I do not object at all to the home city of my friend the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] receiving the benefit of the sale of goods for three States, but I think it is very hard on Delaware and New Jersey.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. I object to transferring the offices to Philadelphia. We have had an office in our State for 7 years. It has worked satisfactorily. However, I have heard that it is proposed to move it to Philadelphia. I am rather averse to this regional shifting around, and I think the office ought to remain where it now is.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. I quite agree with the Senator from Delaware. I hope neither the Delaware office nor the New Jersey office will be moved to Philadelphia. In my opinion, they should remain where they now are.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank my friend, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, for the manly, courageous, and fair position he takes on this question.

I have my hand on the shoulder of the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and I want to call his attention to what has been done to Kentucky. They did not even pay any attention to the majority leader when they established these new regions, for hereafter the purchase of several million dollars of supplies for the State of Kentucky will be made in Ohio. They will be bought at Cleveland, Ohio. They did not even select a place close to my friend from Kentucky; they could have put it at Cincinnati, which is a great city, but the Budget Director—a fine man, I have no doubt—put Kentucky in Ohio, and in Cleveland, Ohio. [Laughter.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I hope the Senator will not fail to emphasize to the majority leader and to other Senators that, in addition to the removal of purchases, either all the employees in these divisions will be discharged or they will be moved out of the State—one or the other. To me that is more important than is the matter of purchasing supplies.

Mr. McKELLAR. It means something, of course, but the purchasing of supplies ought to be made in the State in which they are used.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not the first thing they have done to me, for Kentucky has to go to Cleveland to borrow money, when it could borrow it at Louisville. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Now I come to the next one, region 5. Oh, we are going to lose the word "State" from our vocabulary. It will not be long, if the plan works well in this instance, until we will move other activities to these great regions.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, the Senator did not confine the T. V. A. to State lines, did he?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. A national project is to be treated nationally. We have no reason for a region in connection with the T. V. A. [Laughter.]

The T. V. A. is truly national in its scope and character. It is in five or six States, but, thank Heaven, it has not been placed in a region.

Mr. BARKLEY. God made the Tennessee River, but he did not make these regional offices. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. It will not be long before the Budget Director will be rearranging the Tennessee River just as he is rearranging the Ohio River. [Laughter.]

I next come to Washington. Where are the Senators from Maryland, North Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia? [Laughter.] I do not know whether they are here or not, but in their several States the purchases made for W. P. A. are going to be taken out of those several States and turned over to Washington. Great Washington City! Long may she wave and prosper. She is doing pretty well; I have nothing but the kindest feelings and interest toward Washington; I like to live here a part of the year; but I do not think that Washington should be preferred over Baltimore in this matter.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to tell me where he derives the statement that purchasing will be taken away from the States where they are now made?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read from a statement:

Our merchants and contractors in Tennessee—

Mr. ADAMS. May I ask from what the Senator is reading?

Mr. McKELLAR. From Mr. R. B. Beal, a gentleman from Nashville, Tenn., who wrote me about it.

Mr. ADAMS. He is not connected with W. P. A., is he?

Mr. McKELLAR. Not in any way, so far as I know.

Mr. ADAMS. There is not in the bill now under consideration any provision which would in any way remove purchasing authority and power from where it now is. I will say to the Senator that the record shows that it would only take \$175,000 to keep the procurement offices where they are now, and that is not a major issue in this particular matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. We all know that merchants in Memphis, for instance, will not care to go to Atlanta, which is 350 or 400 miles away. Yet our merchants will have to go there to bid; they cannot bid unless they do go there, and when they go there they are outside looking in; they no longer have any local position; the Atlanta officials may not be particularly interested in Memphis sellers. Probably the Mississippi merchants—I will find out from the Mississippi people, as I see the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] looking at me. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I ask the Senator not to mention that, because that is a sad story with me. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I know it is a sad story. I wish the Maryland Senators and the North Carolina Senators were present. They are detained on official business.

Mr. HILL. I will say that the Senator from North Carolina has been here during most of this debate, diligently looking after the interests of North Carolina, and he is wholeheartedly in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am happy to hear that. I know both Senators to be able and splendid Senators.

I come to region No. 6. No longer is it the proud State of Georgia, no longer is it the proud State of Tennessee or the proud State of Florida or the proud State of South Carolina; no, they have been merged into the region of Atlanta, Ga.

Alabama; I think Alabama is all right. Both the Senators from Alabama are here. Florida. I do not know how Florida is, but the Senators from Florida are all right. I am sorry they are not here. The rights of their citizens are being invaded by a disregard of their State's rights provided for by the Constitution of the United States.

I next come to region No. 7. Wisconsin is blotted out; Michigan is blotted out; Iowa is blotted out; Indiana is blotted out. Where is—

Mr. MINTON. Here I am. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. You are no longer from Indiana; you are from a region of Chicago. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to thank the Senator from Tennessee for the solicitude he evidences for my State and to tell him that I share very heartily in his expression of views and am going to vote that way when I get an opportunity.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. He is going to have the opportunity in a few minutes to vote for his State so far as I am concerned.

I return, by request, to the region in Washington. I see the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] has come in. I am looking for the other Senator from West Virginia. I am sure he feels the same way about his State. The people of West Virginia will have to come to Washington under this bill.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. Let me assure my distinguished and beloved friend from Tennessee that, so far as my vote is concerned, the Treasury's employees who are now stationed in West Virginia will not be transferred to Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. I wish that this fervent objection to people leaving their States and coming to Washington might have prevailed during the earlier days of the present administration, when there was a great army besieging Washington. They left Tennessee and West Virginia to come to Washington, and they are now here by the tens of thousands. They had no reluctance about coming to Washington then, and I know, so far as my State is concerned, they are still willing to come here.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator was a little too fast for me. If any Tennesseans came to Washington, it was so long ago that I have forgotten what a new Tennessean in Washington looks like. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. They are willing to come.

Mr. McKELLAR. They may be willing, but they do not get the opportunity.

I next come to region No. 8; no longer Missouri and Arkansas, but region No. 8. Here is one of the Senators from region No. 8, the distinguished senior Senator [Mrs. CARAWAY], one of the best-known women in the world, an able and distinguished woman. I wonder if she wants to abolish the Arkansas State lines and become a part of the "region of Missouri"?

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I beg leave to state that I am for the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and shall vote for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Fine. I thank the Senator. Where is the colleague of the senior Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. MILLER. Here I am.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is right on the job; and I now see him. The Senator does not want to abolish his State, does he, so far as the purchase of these supplies is concerned?

Mr. MILLER. I shall not consent to the abolishment of the State offices, and shall vote for the amendment of the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to announce that I have been called to the telephone so that if I am absent the Senator will realize why I am absent. I am listening with great approval to what he is saying. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. He is an able Senator, and represents a great State.

I next come to Minnesota, region No. 9; North Dakota and South Dakota have been abolished. Let me say

to my handsome young friend sitting in front of me that, so far as his State is concerned, all purchases are going to be given to Minnesota. But that is not all. There is another region—Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma.

Here is my distinguished friend, GEORGE NORRIS, who served in the House—I started to say “one of the elder statesmen,” but I would not have been correct about that—when I went there 30 years ago, and has been serving in Congress all this time with fidelity and honor. He thought he was coming from Nebraska. He has always said he came from Nebraska; but under this joint resolution he comes from region No. 10. [Laughter.]

I now come to California and Nevada. California is the region, and Nevada becomes a part of California in that region.

The next is Arizona; and California gets that State too. California gets two of them. Nevada was one. Arizona was the other.

Here is region No. 13. When I first came to the House, 30 years ago, one of the handsomest, one of the most dashing, one of the most eloquent men in the House at that time—I think I heard him 2 or 3 days after I got there, and I had no idea there were any such orators in the country as he was—was my friend PAT HARRISON. I was told he was from Mississippi, but that was wrong. He is not from Mississippi. He is from region No. 14, at New Orleans. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I am in sympathy with what the Senator is saying.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

The next States are Idaho and Utah. Idaho is swallowed up by Utah, and Oregon is swallowed up by Washington.

The remarkable thing about the Budget Director is that he has disposed of the States of both the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] and the minority leader [Mr. McNARY]. He puts the majority leader in Ohio and he puts the minority leader in Washington. I do not think he is right in either case.

I think I need not pursue this matter further. We have pursued it somewhat in a good-humored way this afternoon, but I have brought it to the attention of the Senate in this way just to show the true situation.

Mr. GREEN and Mr. ADAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Rhode Island. Then I will yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I have listened with great admiration to this catalog of States, and the tributes paid to each; but I exceedingly regret that the Senator from Tennessee has been guilty of a sin of omission. I know he is often guilty of sins of commission, but not of sins of omission. Of the 48 States he has enumerated 47, and has omitted the greatest in every respect except geographical size, and that is the State of Rhode Island.

I hope he will not omit that State, because I know that all the residents of Rhode Island, when they read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow, will be very much disappointed, and I probably shall receive a thousand telegrams asking me why Rhode Island was overlooked.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator let me lend him a pair of microscopic glasses so that he can see the State of Rhode Island? [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator, but I have been in the State of Rhode Island. It is not a large State, but it is a wonderful State. It has many factories. It has many industries. There are many businesses there. It is a great State. The people of Rhode Island are a great people.

When the Government buys wares and merchandise through the W. P. A. for use in the State of Rhode Island, it ought to buy them from the merchants and businessmen of Rhode Island. In some way it seems that the Senator's State is not included in these lists as I hastily looked at them. That is the only reason why I happened to omit it.

I want to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that there was nothing personal about my action, either to him or to his State, because the Senator is a splendid representative of his State, whom I honor very, very greatly. He serves on the Appropriations Committee with me, and I know there is no more diligent or faithful or able Senator in this body than the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his tribute; and I am only sorry that I am not running for reelection this year. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will be reelected often.

I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I simply want to say that I heard the Senator refer to his own remarks as humorous. I should not want his patriotic appeal to be referred to lightly, or as humorous, because I know that some of us who have endeavored to stand up against the “blitzkrieg” feel as little Holland felt when assailed by Hitler. This is certainly a most patriotic, serious matter, and I appreciate what is happening.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that when the Government purchases supplies for use in a State, if there are in the State mercantile establishments and business houses and factories from which the supplies can be purchased, probably more reasonably than elsewhere, and without the payment of freight charges and commissions, it seems to me the Government will save money by purchasing the supplies there. I believe the plan which has been so admirably, so honestly, so fairly, and justly carried on during these 7 years of W. P. A. should be continued. Nobody has ever heard a complaint about the system from the Purchasing Department of the Treasury during that time, and I do not think it ought to be changed now. I do not think it ought to be consolidated in the way that is proposed.

Take the State of Missouri as an example: Missouri has two offices. One was not enough. Somebody felt extremely kindly toward Missouri. The present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], was put in Ohio; but some people in States around Missouri were put in the eastern part of Missouri at St. Louis, and others were put in the western part of Missouri at Kansas City. I have nothing in the world against Missouri or St. Louis or Kansas City, but I think these activities ought to be carried on in each of the States where they can be better managed and more economically managed, as shown by actual experience. I think the business ought to be transacted in the various States.

I certainly hope the Senate will adopt the amendment offered by my distinguished friend from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] which I transfer to the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON], and will vote. I vote “yea.”

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are necessarily detained.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] is detained by illness in his family.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present

and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would vote "nay."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] if present would vote "yea." He is unavoidably detained on official duties.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has a general pair with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN].

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. FRAZIER] has a general pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

My colleague, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. GIBSON], would vote "yea," if present. He is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 7, as follows:

YEAS—69

Andrews	Donahy	Lee	Schwellenbach
Ashurst	Ellender	Lodge	Sheppard
Austin	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bailey	Gerry	McKellar	Smith
Bankhead	Gillette	McNary	Stewart
Barkley	Green	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Hale	Minton	Tobey
Bulow	Harrison	Murray	Townsend
Capper	Hatch	Neely	Wagner
Caraway	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Chandler	Herring	Overton	Wheeler
Chavez	Hill	Pepper	White
Clark, Idaho	Holman	Pittman	Wiley
Connally	Hughes	Radcliffe	
Danaher	King	Reed	
Davis	La Follette	Schwartz	

NAYS—7

Adams	Lucas	Nye	Taft
Byrnes	Norris	Slattery	

NOT VOTING—20

Barbour	Downey	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bone	Frazier	Johnson, Colo.	Truman
Burke	Gibson	McCarran	Tydings
Byrd	Glass	Reynolds	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Holt	Russell	Van Nuys

So the amendment of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma was agreed to.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add a new section at the end of the joint resolution to read as follows:

SEC. 40. The President is hereby authorized through such agency or agencies as he may designate to purchase exclusively in the United States and to transport and distribute as hereinafter provided, agricultural, medical, and other supplies for the relief of refugee men, women, and children, who have been driven from their homes or otherwise rendered destitute by hostilities or invasion. When so purchased, such materials and supplies are hereby authorized to be distributed by the President through the American Red Cross or such governmental or other agencies as he may designate. The cost of such distribution shall be paid out of the appropriation herein provided for.

There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$50,000,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section.

On or before December 31, 1940, the President shall submit to the Congress an itemized and detailed report of the expenditures and activities made and conducted under the authority herein conferred.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, this amendment is suggested to carry out the recommendation which the President of the United States made by letter a few days ago, to provide a fund of \$50,000,000 for the relief of refugees in Europe made destitute by invasion and by hostilities. It is not only to carry out the recommendation of the President, but it follows very closely the lines of a resolution which has been pending here, offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]. It is something which has been very close to his heart; and to a certain extent we have taken it out of his hands, but the amendment carries out his idea. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the majority leader, has also been instrumental in formulating the amendment. As I have said, it carries out the idea and purpose of extending help to those in Europe who have been reduced to a most unfortunate condition of destitution as a result of the outrages which have been perpetrated in their countries by invasion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has just occurred to me that, inasmuch as Congress may not be in session on the 31st of December, 1940, but will meet on January 3, 1941, that date be substituted as the date on which the President should make his report.

Mr. ADAMS. I accept the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is modified as suggested.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY obtained the floor.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana permit me to add one word to what I have heretofore stated regarding the amendment just adopted?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. The Red Cross is named as one of the agencies through which the President may act. The amendment was not offered at the instance of the Red Cross; that is, they are not requesting the appropriation. They are willing to act as an agent, but they have heretofore, so far as their own solicitation is concerned, solicited funds only from private individuals. The purchases of property under the amendment will be handled by the Federal Government, and the Red Cross will merely act as a distributing agency.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield for a moment, the amendment adopted a few moments ago provides that the State offices shall be retained in the identical places where they are now. The Senator from Colorado, in charge of the joint resolution, made the statement that it would take more money to maintain them where they are. If that is true, it would be a persuasive argument in conference to disagree to the amendment just agreed to, unless the money is provided. I submit an amendment providing that \$1,200,000 be properly distributed. The amendment will apply in four places, but I ask that it may be considered as one amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "\$5,600,000" and to insert "\$6,300,000"; on line 11, to strike out "\$3,225,000" and to insert "\$3,625,000"; on line 12, to strike out "\$1,724,516" and to insert "\$1,924,516"; on line 17, to strike out "\$9,429,916" and to insert "\$10,729,916."

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I did not catch where the amendments would appear in the joint resolution. Is there to be an addition to the appropriation for the General Accounting Office?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In four items on page 17. The first item is increased by the sum of \$700,000.

Mr. ADAMS. The General Accounting Office is not involved in this discussion at all. The General Accounting Office appropriation is increased \$1,000,000 over last year's appropriation already in the joint resolution. The General Accounting Office is now doing \$3,000,000 worth of work for activities other than relief. There should under no conditions be an increase in this appropriation.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. This will go to conference, and if the conferees find that these sums are too large, or are not needed, I am sure that under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Colorado they will be eliminated.

The second item is on page 17, line 11, the third on line 12, and the fourth on line 17.

Mr. ADAMS. We cannot even take it to conference.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have the figures which were testified to by the Treasury Department in the hearings. The exact figures necessary to retain the situation as it is now were given.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I withdraw the amendment temporarily.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move to change the figures—

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I withdraw the amendment, if I may have permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is temporarily withdrawn.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have two amendments on the desk which I desire to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "\$975,650,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$1,488,000,000", and on page 7, to strike out beginning with line 18 through line 13 on page 8, and to insert the following:

The amount which may be obligated for administrative expenses of the Work Projects Administration in the District of Columbia and in the field for the fiscal year 1941 shall not exceed 5 percent of the sum appropriated in subsection (a) of this section.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, my first amendment provides for an increase of the amount appropriated for W. P. A. by about 50 percent, for the purpose of utilizing a greater number of the unemployed workers of the country in connection with our national-defense program. The second amendment is to set a maximum of 5 percent of the total W. P. A. appropriation for administrative expenses.

In this period of great national emergency, I submit that an adequate W. P. A. program can and should be provided to effectively fit into our national-defense plans. I think it can be clearly demonstrated that this can be done.

Mr. President, aside from the threat of war now hovering over us, unemployment is the most serious danger to our national security.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I apologize to the Senator for interrupting his remarks, but I wish to express the hope that Senators will remain here in the effort to dispose of the pending bill tonight. There are two or three important measures awaiting consideration that are a part of the national-defense program. It is very desirable and necessary that they be disposed of this week, because the Finance Committee will report the tariff bill either tomorrow or Saturday, and it is contemplated that we will begin consideration of that bill Monday. Therefore, I hope Senators will remain here and cooperate as much as possible to try to conclude consideration of the pending bill today, so that we may be able to dispose of these other measures before we adjourn for the week.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as I was saying, aside from the threat of war that hangs over our country, the greatest threat to our national security is the serious unemployment condition that continues in this country. It constitutes a continuing threat to our internal peace and safety. I, therefore, contend that if these millions of unemployed workers can be utilized in carrying out any part of our national-defense program, there can be no reasonable excuse for our failure to do so.

Under my first amendment, I propose to expand the W. P. A. from an average of 1,900,000 jobs to an average of 3,000,000, and put these men to work on the most essential national-defense projects that can be conceived; projects absolutely indispensable in connection with our program of national defense.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that the Senator's amendment not only increases the amount, but permits the President to use the increased amount in 8 months?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. So that, as a matter of fact, the proposed appropriation would represent approximately two and one-quarter million dollars for the year, if the President were to exercise that power?

Mr. MURRAY. No; my amendment expresses exactly what is intended. The amount is appropriated for the 8 months as specified in the measure.

If we expend our naval and military air forces as proposed in the measures already passed, we must certainly be required to expand our air bases, landing fields, runways, airway beacons, airway markers, underground hangars, and build-

ings and plants of various kinds necessary to accommodate the enormously expanded air forces contemplated. Likewise, the mechanization and expansion of our military forces will require a tremendous program of construction of a character W. P. A. may undertake, such as armories, barracks, warehouses, cantonments, military roads, training fields, machine shops, and various plants and buildings necessary to house a greatly expanded and mechanized Army. My amendment undertakes to provide such a program. If we follow such a course we will contribute in a large measure to the removal of the greatest threat in this country to our national prosperity and unity.

Because I am convinced that this work-relief measure, if made effective through these proposed amendments, is vital to our program of national defense; and because I firmly believe that in this period of national emergency a W. P. A. program can be made to tie in closely with our plans for national defense I would like to take the time to discuss the problem in some detail.

I need not now dwell on the history of unemployment during the past 10 years or the tragic suffering and destitution caused by the break-down of our economic system which made necessary the adoption of our present policy of national relief for the unemployed. Every humane-minded citizen in the country has recognized the necessity for the assumption by the Federal Government of this obligation to relieve the distress of our workers who, through no fault of their own, were rendered jobless and destitute during the period of the depression. That policy had the practically unanimous approval of the American people. It was recognized as the only humane thing that the Government could do under the circumstances.

It is to be regretted, however, that soon after the adoption of this Federal policy, political propaganda designed to discredit it began to have its effect; and at no time during the depression has the policy of national relief been permitted to operate fully and effectively. We have experienced a series of ups and downs in the administration of national relief, but the net result of the entire program was to furnish only partial assistance to a very limited number of the Nation's unemployed. Notwithstanding all this, our national policy of work relief will stand out in the future history of this period as a great accomplishment of the present Democratic administration.

W. P. A., intended for the relief of millions of unemployed and destitute citizens, early became a national political football and has been kicked around the halls of Congress and the country at large ever since its inception. Efforts to destroy it and force the unemployed back on charity and local relief have been constantly and vigorously pressed throughout the depression. On one occasion its enemies succeeded in so seriously curtailing W. P. A. appropriations that a serious recession resulted, making it necessary for the Congress to make prompt and greatly increased appropriations to offset the disastrous conditions that had developed. Appropriations for W. P. A. have been constantly opposed, limited, and circumscribed in such a manner and to such a degree that it is really remarkable that W. P. A. was able to accomplish the splendid record it has. Every time a relief measure was considered it was charged that the relief program was destroying the Nation; that we could not afford these large sums for the relief of unemployed and destitute workers. It was charged here that the W. P. A. was an imported, socialistic scheme, foreign to our democracy, and that it was designed principally to perpetuate in office the New Deal administration. It was claimed that the recipients of relief were unworthy, lazy, good-for-nothing, and that they did not want to work. It was charged that its only result would be to bankrupt the Nation.

Speaking on the floor a few days ago the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] said, as will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, June 6, 1940, at page 7676:

I have learned to have great respect and admiration for the men in this body. I have heard man after man in this Chamber assert

without any challenge that adding more debt to our presently inflated debt structure would be fatal to America. That is correct, is it not? Is there any dissent from that?

A number of gentlemen who are at the present moment candidates for nomination on the Republican ticket are saying to the people of this country from platform after platform that if we add any more to the present national debt damnation lies at our door. Many of my own brethren on this side of the aisle, in the Democratic Party, have assured us time after time that if we continue to add to our debt we are going to hell financially.

So those people who have been opposing a national work-relief program were willing to have the country go to damnation socially, morally, and economically so long as they were able to defeat appropriations and discredit the W. P. A. But today there is no dissent in this body in regard to the enormous appropriations we are making for necessary national defense. We are talking today of spending fifty billions for national defense if necessary. We are enthusiastic about such appropriations because we are impressed that it is essential for the safety and security of the Nation. We are all willing to appropriate billions in a war to defend democracy from without.

Mr. President, true defense of our country is not merely a matter of armaments or airplanes. It is a matter of loyal and patriotic spirit in the hearts of our people. That cannot be brought into existence by a program for expanded armaments. I wonder if it would not be a wise policy to appropriate a few extra millions now to strengthen our democracy within and let the great masses of our unemployed feel that they occupy a place under our democratic system. I think that would be sound statesmanship. It would accomplish more for the real defense of democracy than all the armaments we may be able to provide through the billions of dollars we are appropriating.

Huge appropriations for armaments, billions spent for national defense, will not alone be sufficient to safeguard and defend our country. These things standing alone may only hasten our dissolution. Our first line of defense must always be a loyal, contented, and patriotic people at home.

I will not attempt to discuss the cause of this great scourge of unemployment which has been inflicted on our country. It is not necessary to undertake to place the blame for it in connection with the situation now confronting us. It is sufficient for the purpose now under consideration to point out that at the present time we have over 10,000,000 workers, willing and able to work, who are unable to find employment in private industry. Currently, the W. P. A. is employing only about 1,900,000 out of this great horde of unemployed workers. I understand that before June 30, the end of the present fiscal year, this number will be further reduced to 1,700,000, a reduction of 200,000 in 2 months. During the fiscal year 1940, W. P. A. will have carried an average of 1,900,000 workers on its rolls. The present W. P. A. relief measure, as reported, provides \$975,000,000 for the work program, which, if expended during the first 8 months of the next fiscal year, will furnish an average of 1,900,000 jobs for that period. This would represent less than 20 percent of the Nation's unemployed.

What, then, is to be done about the remaining millions of unemployed workers? Can the Government afford, in times like these, to ignore the dangerous consequences to our national morale of such a colossal failure of government and industry to provide work for unemployed citizens? If they are permitted to remain idle, their skills deteriorate and their morale is shattered. Their health, and the health of their families, are affected.

It is people like these, Mr. President—discouraged and disillusioned workers who are made to feel that they are not wanted and not needed in our society—who make suitable raw material for a "fifth column" in this country.

With all the work that needs doing in this country, when we should be straining every effort for our national defense, when we should be doing everything in our power to prove the successful operation of democratic institutions, in my judgment it is almost criminal to permit millions of our able-bodied citizens to rust in idleness. The Federal Government cannot afford to shirk this responsibility.

When the W. P. A. was created in the spring of 1935 it was intended that the Federal Government should take the major responsibility for workers who are in need, and who are able to work, by giving them employment on a works program; and the States, cities, and towns kept the major responsibility for the unemployables—the aged, the blind, the dependent children, and all those who, because of physical or mental defects, are unfitted for work. The States and localities are taking care of their unemployables, and are contributing 25 percent of the cost of W. P. A. projects. But the Federal Government does not employ all our needy employables. Instead, those whom the W. P. A. cannot employ also go to the local direct relief agencies, and increase the already heavy burdens of our communities.

My first amendment, to increase the appropriation by approximately one-half billion dollars, would permit the Federal Government to carry out its share of the responsibility on a more adequate basis. It would put a million more people who are employable and in need to work on the W. P. A. program, and thus relieve the financial pressure on our States and communities. At the same time we should be constructing essential national defenses.

Hard work, Mr. President, has been the cornerstone of American democracy. By depriving millions of our workers of the chance to earn a living for themselves and their families by their own efforts and labor, we are endangering our American democracy. We are setting up a class apart from the main body of our citizens. We are saying to these people, "We don't need you. We don't want you. You are economic outcasts." That is not the American way, Mr. President. Such an attitude is not worthy of us as a democracy.

We need the loyalty and devotion of every American citizen in every State, city, county, and village, however humble he may be. Unemployment and destitution are foundations of sand in building patriotism. To place this Nation on a solid foundation we must give assurances, and put those assurances into action, that this Nation can, and will, provide work for those of its citizens who cannot find employment in private enterprise, but who are able, willing, and anxious to work. We have not been realistic in dealing with the problems inherent in widespread and persistent unemployment. We have hoped that, somehow or other, the problem would vanish, that some miracle would happen to provide jobs for all the unemployed. But that miracle has not happened; and we cannot base legislation on the possibility of a miracle.

Today there are between eight and nine million more Americans who have jobs than were employed in 1933; and still we have some 10,000,000 unemployed. These figures sound contradictory, but they are not. We must remember that in 1933 we had at least 14,000,000 unemployed. Since then the labor market has been augmented by more than 600,000 workers each year, or more than 4,000,000 additional workers in the past 7 years. That is why we still have 10,000,000 unemployed workers today. I should be the last person to deny that we have made great forward strides in meeting our unemployment problem, both in reducing the number of unemployed and in the technique of handling relief. But I feel that our unemployment problem is still our No. 1 problem, more important than any other problem facing us; more important, even, than our problem of defense; because I believe a nation cannot build an adequate defense system without some semblance of economic security and without a high morale of its citizenry.

When the European war broke out last summer, many persons believed that the titanic struggle in Europe would solve our unemployment problem in the United States. Now, they thought, the troublesome problem of unemployment will vanish into thin air. Now there will be more jobs than available workmen. But what happened? Soon after the outbreak of the war there was a decided increase in industrial activity. Large orders were placed with manufacturers on the strength of increased exports. But many firms were placing large orders merely to build up their inventories in

anticipation of price increases. The industrial production index rose from 103 in August to 128 in December of last year. The December index figure surpassed even the best achievements of 1929. Our production index was at an all-time high. During this period employment increased by 1,140,000 workers. We were told by some optimists and wishful thinkers that we no longer needed a W. P. A. program. In their enthusiasm they even forgot that a portion of this increase was the normal seasonal increase which occurs every year. But, unfortunately, we soon learned that the increase in employment was to be short lived. Soon our merchants found themselves with large inventories on their hands, and without customers to absorb them. While exports to some countries increased, to other countries they were curtailed, and to still other countries they were completely cut off. The industrial production figure declined from its high of 128 in December of last year to 102 in April of this year, a most disastrous drop. During the same period industrial employment rapidly decreased by about 1,000,000. It is estimated that by August industrial employment may rise to approximately 108. This, even if true, will be but a slight improvement over present conditions.

War orders have speeded up some isolated industries, but on the whole business in this country is not sound. Our agricultural situation has been aggravated. Our export and import trade has been disrupted. Our shipping industry has been hurt. Every time another country is dragged into the war, our trade suffers. Italy's recent entrance, and the extension of the theater of war over the entire Mediterranean Sea, means a tremendous interference with our foreign trade, and a further drop in industrial production. The gains we have made in a few industries which manufacture airplanes, engines, tanks, and machinery have been more than offset by the dislocations in the rest of our economy. But now there are those who believe that our new defense program will absorb all our unemployed; that they will all find jobs in private industry; that unemployment will vanish from the American landscape. Let us not be too optimistic about this. Let us not again be fooled.

The editor of the United States News, discussing this subject, said:

The matter is by no means so simple. The labor required will be largely in specialized, highly skilled employments, and the plant capacity utilized will not be spread, but will be concentrated, for the most part, in a few heavy industries capable of turning out planes, tanks, guns, ammunition, and ships.

The President has already publicly stated that the national-defense program which he has set forth will not substantially lessen the plight of those who are eligible for W. P. A. employment. We must remember that the amount appropriated will necessarily be spent slowly, and whatever stimulation the defense program will give to industry will not be of great momentum before the end of the calendar year.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Am I to understand that the Senator from Montana thinks the present defense program will not absorb any appreciable number of unemployed before next January?

Mr. MURRAY. That is exactly true, and it is borne out by the studies of statisticians and economists.

Mr. BRIDGES. With the world aflame in June, we shall not get the program under way before the first of the year. Is that the Senator's idea?

Mr. MURRAY. The program will not appreciably increase employment until toward the end of the year. This is due to the dislocation of industry in other respects because of the war.

Mr. BRIDGES. In other words, the Senator believes that the program will not get going until January 1?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not say it will not get going before January 1. It will be started, but it will not and cannot absorb the millions of unemployed in the country or make an appreciable impression on unemployment until the first of next year. This is due in a degree to the new unemployment in other industries by reason of the war.

Mr. BRIDGES. With the world aflame, someone will be very negligent if the program does not get going before next January 1.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. I wish to recall the fact that in the early part of his speech the Senator emphasized the fact that our shipping was being dislocated, that our commerce was being curtailed, and that naturally unemployment would follow as the result of these curtailments; and that, while employment would result from war industries, it would not in any measurable degree affect the totals of unemployment for the time being.

Mr. MURRAY. That is exactly correct. Economists who have studied the situation point out that as a result of the destruction of our import and export trade, the loss in shipping, and the manner in which our industry generally is affected as a result of the war, there would be a severe and dangerous panic in the country at the present moment were it not for the fact that a national-defense program is under consideration. As I pointed out in the early part of my remarks, more than a million men were laid off in private industry during this spring.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again at that point?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I have here a clipping from the New York Times dated as late as April 27, after Great Britain had been in the war for approximately 8 months. This clipping states that Great Britain at that time had 1,121,212 persons wholly or temporarily unemployed, and Great Britain at that time had 2,000,000 men under arms. Besides that, she had her war industries working 24 hours a day; and as late as April 27—a very short, brief time ago—she had an unemployment program involving over 1,000,000 persons.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator has stated the situation exactly. The same conditions exist in this country, but in a much exaggerated degree. In this country, instead of only a million or two unemployed, we have between nine and ten million unemployed. Does this country propose to allow to remain in idleness those nine or ten million men who will be candidates for "fifth column" activities if our Government does not do something about the matter? I think it would be the most unwise policy for our Government to pursue. The only safe thing for us to do is to strengthen ourselves at home. While we are preparing for defense from enemies abroad, let us protect ourselves from the danger of trouble from within.

We must remember, too, that the defense funds will be spent in industries which employ relatively little common labor. Even if employment in aircraft, machine-tool, and shipbuilding industries were doubled from their April level, and employment in steel mills returned to the peak it reached last fall—and this is a very optimistic assumption—it would mean the employment of only 290,000 workers. This is but a fraction of the number of unemployed. Armament reemployment will be concentrated in specific skilled trades. There are but very few skilled workers of the type necessary for an armament program on the W. P. A. rolls. Some indirect employment, resulting from factory expansion and from increased transportation, will materialize from the defense program, but not enough measurably to affect the unemployment problem. Even if indirect employment resulting from the defense program is eventually twice the amount of direct employment, the total new employment to be hoped for will not exceed 800,000, or 8 percent of the total number unemployed; and very little of this employment can come about in the next few months.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does not the Senator think that instead of putting more money and still more money into projects

along the line of his amendment we ought at this time to be spending the money we have available, outside of taking care of the actual relief needs, for national defense?

Mr. MURRAY. That is exactly what I am trying to accomplish by this amendment. We have established the fact that the W. P. A. is competent to construct naval air bases and military air bases, landing fields, and work of that character. It has already proven its capacity to do work of that kind.

I have here on my desk a report showing the marvelous record of the W. P. A. along those lines. For instance, here is a report from the National Aeronautic Association for use in the National Aeronautics Magazine. This is not W. P. A. propaganda. It comes from the National Aeronautics Association.

It makes a lengthy statement of what has been done by W. P. A. in preparing this country for defense. I shall not take the time to read it. Attached to the article is a list of the W. P. A. airports and airway projects and military fields. They have already been constructed under the W. P. A.; and yet there are in this country persons who want to discredit W. P. A. and make it appear that it contains only a gang of lazy, good-for-nothing persons. It has been making a marvelous record, as shown by this report, in practically every State in the Union.

I ask that this report from the National Aeronautics Association be printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

GROUND FACILITIES FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

The American Nation, confronted with the task of building quickly a national air defense adequate in view of existing war conditions abroad, has at least an encouraging start in the expansion during the last 5 years of its airport and airways facilities.

Strategically spaced throughout the country are nearly 200 new airports that did not exist in 1935 and nearly 370 airports that have been extended or improved since that time. This work has been the contribution of the Work Projects Administration, which, while aiding civil aviation, at the same time provided facilities important to the country's air forces in time of war.

Approximately \$200,000,000 in Federal and sponsors' funds has been expended on the expansion of the Nation's network of airports, landing fields, and aviation facilities. In carrying out this program W. P. A. workers have constructed and improved a total of 51 airports of a strictly military and naval character at Army, Navy, and National Guard sites. In addition to this work, carried out under W. P. A. State programs at a total cost of approximately \$17,000,000, the Army and Navy have expended, as of March 31, 1940, nearly \$15,000,000 of W. P. A. funds, transferred by W. P. A. to the War and the Navy Departments for the construction by W. P. A. workers of naval and military aviation facilities. Forty-four military and naval air stations and flying fields (exclusive of air facilities at regular military and naval posts) have benefited from work completed or under way with these W. P. A. funds.

Even before W. P. A. airport projects had received attention under the work-relief program, \$32,036,241 worth of work was performed by the Civil Works Administration and the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, W. P. A.'s predecessors, between 1933 and 1935.

W. P. A. has been the principal contributor to the rapid development of airports and aviation facilities in recent years. The Civil Aeronautics Authority in a report sent to Congress in March 1939 said:

"The Work Projects Administration has been the paramount factor in the airport development of the last 4 years. . . . Federal expenditures made through the agency of the Work Projects Administration represent nearly one-third of the total amount spent on all airport developments from 1911 up to the present time, and more than 55 percent of the expenditures since 1932."

Work performed on strictly military fields and bases has included, in addition to improvements of fields and bases themselves, such as lengthening of runways, grading, leveling, draining, etc., construction and improvement of buildings, not only of hangars but of barracks, mess halls, and other structures necessary to the proper quartering of planes and personnel.

The W. P. A. and the Navy Department cooperated in \$1,000,000 worth of improvements at the naval air base at Squantum, Mass., scene of tremendous activity in 1917 and 1918. Work of similar magnitude was carried on at Army's Lowry Field, Denver; Bolling Field, Washington, D. C.; Mitchel Field, Long Island; and Navy's Reeves Field, Los Angeles. Some \$2,000,000 was spent on improvements at Miller Field, New York, used by both the Army and the National Guard, while \$1,500,000 was spent on the development of the Sand Point Naval Air Station at Seattle, Wash. Some of the work performed by the War and Navy Departments, operating with funds allocated directly to them from relief appropriations, was carried on at airports and bases where projects also were operated under

the W. P. A. State programs. The Federal agency program also included work at fields in the strategically important possessions of Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Aside from the work performed directly on military air fields, W. P. A.'s general airports program has been of great military significance, studding the country as it has with airports and landing fields suitable for military use in emergencies. Since 1935 the W. P. A. has built and improved airports and landing fields, constructed better, longer, and safer runways, seaplane ramps, and landing platforms and has provided a variety of other improvements. Some 90 percent of the Nation's regular air-line stops now in actual use have been benefited by the W. P. A. program.

However, in this field of civil-aviation development W. P. A.'s work has gone far beyond service to fields important to trunk-line flying. Landing fields have been made available in all parts of the country in communities where, because of lack of regular air travel, there had been no place where aircraft might land safely in emergency. The construction and modernization of civil airports in the less populous sections of the country may be considered of particular military value.

South Dakota, for example, until recently without any regular aviation facilities, now has airports in Pierre, Huron, Rapid City, and Spearfish, thus linking all sections of the State. In Maine, to mention but another instance, regular air service has been made available to the Canadian border.

The new municipal airport at Denver, Colo., is a commercial airport, but as an example of its military value, even in peacetime, the work there has included the construction of a reinforced concrete hangar for the Colorado National Guard. The hangar provides space for 24 planes, with two 2-story wings in which space is included for photographic, radio, medical, armament, and parachute sections, operations office, locker rooms, enlisted men's and officers' clubrooms, conference, and instruction rooms. The hangar is 121 by 140 feet with a concrete floor, a 2-inch plank roof supported by 7 steel trusses on 14 steel columns on each side of the building, tubular steel hangar doors of the around-the-corner type, and 20,000 square feet of concrete-surfaced apron at the entrance. A 10-car concrete garage also was built for the national guard.

As of April 1, 1940, W. P. A. workers had constructed a bituminous runway, 150 feet wide and 6,740 feet long, a bituminous taxi strip 50 feet wide and 3,045 feet long, and 74,000 square yards of bituminous apron. A sand and clay runway 150 feet wide and 5,280 feet long, and a concrete taxi strip 100 feet wide and 250 feet long also were built, while 10 floodlights and 72 boundary lights have been installed.

For drainage, 73 catch basins, 7 manholes, 11,188 feet of French drain, 10,400 feet of drainage ditch, and 12,800 feet of sewer were installed, along with a gasoline line aggregating 5,000 feet of 3-inch diameter.

A considerable number of both large and small fields have been equipped with one or more types of buildings—administrative buildings, terminal buildings, hangars, and miscellaneous structures. The latest W. P. A. inventory lists 387 new buildings and 600 improved structures of all types, of which 155 new buildings and 159 improved structures were hangars.

The W. P. A. program was launched at a time when radical changes in seaplane design necessitated many changes in ramps and landing platforms, and W. P. A. engineers and their technical advisors were careful to insure that their construction kept pace with new developments. At the W. P. A.-built seaplane base at Charleston, S. C., for example, specifications were changed at the last minute to provide a timber ramp with a marine railway and to provide other equipment for the handling of the longer, heavier type of seaplane then coming into use.

This new base, which already has been used as an emergency terminal by a west-bound clipper ship from Europe unable to alight either at New York or Baltimore because of adverse weather, has many natural advantages, among them the year-round favorable climate, and the existence 110 miles inland of Lake Murray, an artificial body of water that can be used as an alternate landing area in event of stormy weather on or near the coast.

W. P. A.'s latest summary shows that 1,756,000 feet of new runways have been built, of which 1,065,000 feet were of high-type surface, and that 372,000 feet of existing runways were improved. Considerable research also has been made by the W. P. A. into various types of hard-surfaced runways. The airport at Purdue, Ind., is serving as a research field, where 12 types of paving are being tried, including concrete, standard bituminous, bituminous stabilization, and calcium chloride with a stabilized base with cotton fabric under bituminous tread; and in conjunction with the Pennsylvania Department of Highways, the W. P. A. has placed 14 different types of paving at the Harrisburg, Pa., airport. This field also is being used for research purposes by the State Highway Department of Pennsylvania and the W. P. A.

A variety of facilities to make flying safer and navigation easier, such as airway markers, beacons, and airport lighting systems has been installed by the W. P. A. Boundary lighting has entailed the installation of 7,873 new standards and improvement to 1,449, the lighting systems varying to meet the peculiar needs of each field. One field whose lighting system has been praised by pilots in the Indianapolis Municipal Airport where the lights used on the W. P. A.-installed instrument approach are set flush with the ground at 100-foot intervals and 50 feet distant from each side of the 5,600-foot runway. Blue mercury vapor lights mark the first 800 feet, white lights the last 2,000, the two colors aiding the pilot to determine the distance along the runway.

Among other safety devices, W. P. A. has established 9,588 new markers and improved 1,559, while building 65 new beacons and improving 10.

W. P. A. has sought to make flying popular, at the same time it labored to make aviation safe. Its recreation division has established classes in airplane model making throughout the United States and at many points instruction in aviation theory has been taught as part of the education program. Instruction in radio aeronautics, for example, has been added to the courses taught at Hasbrouck Heights, N. J., where a former Army Signal Corps officer is in charge. Classes in the theory of flying are held in Hackensack, N. J., and cities in other States, although none presumes to augment instruction with actual flying.

The contemplated program of airplane construction and pilot training makes further expansion of the Nation's airways system an immediate necessity, but the work performed from coast to coast and border to border during the last 5 years has made the job far less formidable than it might have been without the contribution of the Federal work program.

Attached is a list of the principal military and naval air stations and flying fields where W. P. A. workers have made valuable contributions to national defense:

W. P. A. AIRPORT AND AIRWAYS PROJECTS ON MILITARY FIELDS¹
(Sites as of April 1, 1940)

Alabama: Anniston (Riley Field), Army; Birmingham (Roberts Field), National Guard; Montgomery (Maxwell Field), Army.
California: Los Angeles (Reeves Field), Navy; Los Angeles (Griffith Park), National Guard; Riverside (March Field), Army; Sacramento (Army Air Depot); San Francisco (Crissy Field), Army; San Rafael (Hamilton Field), Army; Sunnyvale (Moffett Field), Army; San Diego (Naval Air Station); San Pedro (Naval Air Station).
Colorado: Denver (Lowry Field), Army; Golden (Camp West), National Guard.
District of Columbia: Bolling Field, Army; Anacostia (Naval Air Station).
Florida: Opalocka (Naval Air); Pensacola (Naval Air); Valparaiso (Army Gunnery Base), Elgin.
Georgia: Columbus (Fort Benning), Army; (Lawson Field).
Indiana: Indianapolis (Stout Field), National Guard; Indianapolis (Schoen Field), Army.
Illinois: Belleville (Scott Field), Army; Rantoul (Chanute Field), Army; Rockford (Camp Grant), National Guard; Chicago (Municipal Airport).
Kansas: Fort Riley (Marshall Field), Army.
Kentucky: Fort Knox (Godman Field), Army.
Louisiana: Shreveport (Barksdale Field), Army.
Massachusetts: Ayer (Fort Devens), National Guard; Chicopee Falls (Army Northeast Air Base); Squantum (Naval Air).
Michigan: Grosse Ile (Naval Air); Mount Clement (Selfridge Field).
Missouri: Nevada (National Guard).
Nebraska: Omaha (Fort Crook), Army.
New York State: Hempstead (Mitchel Field), Army; Newburgh (Stewart Field), Army.
New York City: Miller Field (National Guard), Army.
New Jersey: Cape May (Naval Air); Lakehurst (Naval Air); Wrightstown (Camp Dix), Army.
North Carolina: Fort Bragg (Pope Field), Army.
Oklahoma: Fort Sill (Post Field), Army.
Ohio: Dayton (Wright Field), Army; Fairfield (Patterson Field), Army; Cincinnati (Lunken Airport).
Pennsylvania: Middletown (Army Air Depot).
Texas: Dallas (Hensley Field), Army; San Antonio (Duncan Field), Army; San Antonio (Kelly Field), Army; San Antonio (Randolph Field), Army; San Antonio (Brooks Field), Army.
Utah: Ogden (Hill Field), Army; Salt Lake City (Camp Williams), National Guard.
Virginia: Langley Field, Army; Norfolk, Naval Operating Base.
Washington: Fort Lewis (Gray Field), Army; Fort Lewis (McChord Field), Army; Seattle (Sand Point) Naval Air; Vancouver (Pearson Field), Army.
Wisconsin: Camp Douglas, National Guard.
Alaska: Bethel, Tanana Crossing, Ruby, Nulato, McGrath, Tattna, Cordova District.
Puerto Rico: Boringuen Field, Army; San Juan Naval Station.
Virgin Islands: Charlotte Amalie, Army; St. Thomas, Marine Corps Flying Field.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator will admit, will he not, even as strongly as he feels on the subject, that many projects have been constructed by W. P. A., such as monkey houses and mill ponds and things of that kind, that do not contribute greatly to national defense?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not know of any monkey houses that were built by the W. P. A. I regard the W. P. A. as a competent, able agency of the United States Government, which

has done splendid things for the American people. When the history of this period is finally written, I think it will record the fact that the W. P. A. has been one of the greatest activities this administration has undertaken. I do not have the patience to listen to men who want to belittle an agency of that character, which was designed by the Government for the purpose of carrying out a humane program, a program to take care of millions of unemployed persons in this country who are unable to take care of their families, and who are suffering, as a result, from lack of food and from ill health brought on by a depression which they had nothing to do with creating.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not quarrel with the basic purposes of relief. I have always supported it; but I think that instead of giving this glorious picture of the administration of W. P. A., instead of its being one of the glorious pages of American history, it will be one of the blackest.

Mr. MURRAY. I disagree with the Senator. He has a different conception than I have of what the W. P. A. has accomplished. I have visited, in my own State, the marvelous projects that the W. P. A. has constructed there. I have seen the projects constructed in the States of Oregon and Washington. I have seen the McCord Air Field in the city of Tacoma, which is one of the greatest defense projects in the country. I have also had described to me the great naval air base at Sand Point, near the city of Seattle, which is regarded as one of the greatest naval air bases in this country, and other air bases of a similar character—for instance, at San Pedro, Calif., and at San Diego.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I heard a story about this alleged monkey house. I do not know just what it was, but the individual had started out and had driven in an automobile across the State where the monkey-house was supposed to be. He passed a great building in a university that had been built by W. P. A. labor and P. W. A. labor; he passed school-houses; he drove across overpasses, but all he saw was the monkey house, because that was a habitation with which he was familiar. He had a monkey mind. [Laughter.]

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana further yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Wyoming evidently is casting aspersions upon me. So far as that is concerned, I am very willing to stand here and be a critic of W. P. A., as well as to commend the good things it has done.

Mr. MURRAY. I welcome the Senator's criticism.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have been on the floor of the Senate and have heard certain United States Senators compare Harry Hopkins, as Administrator of W. P. A., with the Almighty. That is going to a great extreme. The Senator from Wyoming is going to great extremes. The Senator from Montana is going to extremes.

Of course, the W. P. A. has done some good work. Of course, some form of relief is needed; but all through it has been colored, as I said, with very black pages, with many disgraceful proceedings. Politics has been played all the way through it, and it has been done at the expense of the unfortunate people of the country.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I beg to differ with the distinguished Senator. I think he exaggerates the mistakes which may have occurred in W. P. A. I think he may find a few isolated instances of poor projects; there may be some instances where politics entered into the W. P. A.; but I assert again that, on the whole, the W. P. A. program has been one of the best things this administration has accomplished for the people of this country, as is recognized by leading economic experts. For example, Fortune magazine has had experts study the W. P. A., and I intend to refer to its report

¹ This list does not include aviation facilities and improvements made by the War and Navy Departments with W. P. A. funds at regular Army posts and naval stations, where such facilities are only incidental to broader programs of work. Neither does this list include sites of projects carried out by the Coast Guard with W. P. A. funds.

later on in my remarks. They have found that the W. P. A. is worthy of great respect, even from the big-business interests of the country, because it has greatly helped in saving from bankruptcy some of the large industries of the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. MEAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am glad to learn from the Senator's remarks what he considers the outstanding achievement of the New Deal. I am glad to know he thinks it is the W. P. A.

Mr. MURRAY. If the Senator will read some of the conservative Republican papers, such as *Fortune* magazine, he will get a little education on this subject.

I yield now to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. In view of the fact that the Senator from Montana has mentioned the *Fortune* magazine, which is a conservative publication, let me read a sentence or two from what that magazine said in February last. It stated:

W. P. A.'s worst leaf-raking days are over. From the men who carve toy ducks for poor children out of old Surplus Commodities fruit crates on New York's Tenth Avenue to the women who carry saddle bags of books to the mountain people of Kentucky, there is scarcely a project anywhere that is not eloquent, even if at a whisper, with a sort of social utility.

W. P. A.'s leaf-raking days are over, says *Fortune* magazine, and in the same article to which I just referred *Fortune* magazine states:

W. P. A.'s use of idle skills for the good of society has resulted in a list of accomplishments that read like a psalm to a modern Pharaoh.

That is from *Fortune*, and it occurs to me that anyone who seeks to indict W. P. A., in view of the volume of evidence in its favor, is not making a very helpful or wholesome contribution to the solution of our unemployment problem.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from New York. I appreciate the contribution he has made.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not know what the experience in the different States may be, because it is impossible for any one man to ascertain unless he makes it a point to travel all over this great country, but I do know conditions as they exist in my own State.

In Delaware, W. P. A. has been considered one of the very best activities of the Government, not only for the assistance of people needing relief, those who have needed the things which the W. P. A. was supposed to provide, but because of the various projects in the State which have been undertaken. I am not speaking from a partisan standpoint, not because I happen to advocate the New Deal, but I could bring evidences from every Republican paper in our State of the value of the W. P. A. Every daily newspaper in Delaware is Republican, and I could bring clippings from every one of those Republican newspapers to the effect that in Delaware there has been no politics in W. P. A. The *Wilmington Evening-Evening*, the *Morning News*, and the *Star*, are all Republican papers, and it has not been a month since I noted in their editorial columns statements to the effect that there has been no politics in W. P. A. in Delaware. It may be that it is not so in other States, and it is unfortunate if that be the case. It has also been said that the numerous projects which have been carried on by W. P. A. in Delaware, and the numerous things they have done, were good accomplishments, that they were satisfactory, and that the newspapers had no criticism to make of the W. P. A. in Delaware.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Delaware. I think Senators from practically every State in the Union could verify the observations made by the distinguished Senator from Delaware. I know that in my own State, where all

the newspapers are corporation controlled, the editors have been writing editorials praising the program of the W. P. A. They could not avoid doing that, because the programs which have been carried out were of the very finest character, resulting in building up the State, and improving the various communities in which the projects were constructed. There have been built dams and reservoirs, roads and schoolhouses, and all sorts of projects which have improved the social and economic conditions of our State. As I have said, editorials in all the Republican-controlled newspapers of the State have approved the program.

I have tried in my remarks to show that the program I have in mind in connection with W. P. A. is not a program of work of an unnecessary character, merely to provide employment for the men employed. I am seeking to put these men to work on projects of an essential character in connection with our national-defense program.

It must be obvious to every intelligent person that if we expand our national armaments and air force, about which we are talking in the Senate, a very extensive program of works in the various sections of the country will be required in order to make the program operative.

As I pointed out earlier in my remarks, there is a definite tie-in between this work-relief program which we are discussing and the national-defense program. I wish to emphasize this with all the force I can. A great deal of work which comes under the category of national defense can be done by W. P. A. The W. P. A., for instance, has already built, as I have pointed out, some of the finest national-defense projects to be found in the Nation today. We know they can do this, because they have done it in the past. Recently the W. P. A. published an inventory of accomplishments for the first 4½ years of its operation. Let us examine a few items in this report, and see what W. P. A. workers have already done to bolster our national defense.

Let us first take the matter of airports. The relationship between airports and national defense must be obvious. There is hardly an airport in this country which has not been built or improved by the W. P. A. or one of its predecessors, the C. W. A. or the F. E. R. A. Whether we talk of airports such as the New York City airport, which was built entirely as a W. P. A. project, or of small emergency landing fields, such as we find in every State in the Union, relief workers helped to make them possible.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator referred to what is now called the LaGuardia Airport. That airport will stand for all time, in my opinion, as a monument to the work which the administration has been able to do, because it is regarded as not only the finest airport in this country but as the finest airport in the world today. It not only accommodates the airplanes which come from all over our country, but it is the base for the Pan-American Airlines. It will always stand as a monument to the work of the W. P. A.

Mr. MURRAY. The work of the W. P. A. in the New York project is an answer to the unwarranted attacks made on W. P. A. It proves absolutely the efficiency of the W. P. A., and shows that it has accomplished a great program of improvement in the United States.

The project to which the Senator from New York has just referred is not the only one constructed by the W. P. A. Hundreds of them have been constructed by the W. P. A. They have been constructed in every State of the Union. The W. P. A. has not only constructed airports, such as the one mentioned by the Senator from New York, but has constructed naval air bases and military air bases of the finest character, recognized by the Army and the Navy as perfect projects.

This morning I talked to Admiral Moreell. He called my attention to the splendid work done by the W. P. A. in connection with the Sand Point Naval Base in Seattle, which is regarded as one of the finest naval air bases in the world. There is nothing to excel it. The Army air base at McCord Field, Tacoma, which I believe the distinguished Senator from

North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] had the opportunity to visit sometime ago, is one of the finest air bases in the country.

I do not need to dwell on those things. I hate to hear people attempt to malign the W. P. A. I hate to hear them misrepresent and deceive the public with regard to the W. P. A. To do so is certainly unfair and unjust, and it is unpatriotic. When they do so they are injuring the feelings of men who have taken great pride in the work they have done. In the eastern end of my State, which was affected by the drought, the W. P. A. has built great reservoirs, and the men in charge take great pride in what they have there accomplished. The men in charge of the projects there dwell on the splendid character of the men employed, and the good work they have accomplished, and they feel they are constructing something which is of benefit to their fellow citizens. I feel utterly out of patience with those who attempt to misrepresent the W. P. A. and deceive the people of the United States with respect to a matter of such significance to the welfare of our Nation.

Whether you talk of the great airports in the country, such as the New York City Airport which was built entirely as a W. P. A. project, or of small emergency landing fields, such as you find in every State, relief workers helped make them possible. It is safe to say that if it were not for the increased ground facilities created by relief workers, aviation in this country could not possibly have advanced to where it is today. If it had not been for the W. P. A. program we would indeed be in a sorry situation today with reference to our national defense.

Let us get back to the W. P. A. accomplishment report and see what was done for aviation in just 4½ years. W. P. A. workers constructed 197 new airports, and they reconstructed, made additions to, or made improvements on, 372 others. They have built 1,756,000 feet of new runways, they have improved 372,000 feet of existing runways and they have surfaced 170,000 additional feet. They have built 387 airport buildings and reconstructed or improved 600 others. In addition, they have built thousands of ground lights, airway beacons, and airway markers.

Let us consider what W. P. A. workers have done for automobile transportation—certainly a major item in national defense. W. P. A. workers have constructed or improved a total of 457,000 miles of roads in a 4½-year period. In addition, they have constructed 56,000 new bridges and reconstructed or improved 37,000 others.

In the field of public buildings I will select two items which are definitely related to national defense. W. P. A. workers constructed 156 new hospitals and reconstructed 1,500 others. W. P. A. workers have built 222 new armories—which certainly should be regarded as helpful in our national-defense program—and reconstructed or improved 370 others.

These accomplishments are only a few from a long list. Surely the figures I have quoted above are impressive, and surely the work they represent is of tremendous value in our national defense. These accomplishments were made as part of a general work program—not as a special defense program—yet they represent a very valuable contribution to national defense. Mr. President, what I am getting at is this: If we increase our W. P. A. working force now to 3,000,000, as I am proposing, and if we direct the work insofar as may be possible toward national-defense projects, we can make rapid progress in carrying out a gigantic program of national defense. While we are doing this, we are giving our unemployed citizens an opportunity to support their families by their own efforts, and we are showing them that they are not to be regarded as outcasts but as loyal, patriotic citizens of our Republic.

I think we are fortunate at this time to have as Commissioner of the W. P. A. a Regular Army officer and engineer. While I do not speak for Colonel Harrington, I think it is obvious that he will direct the W. P. A. program to national defense, insofar as he is permitted to do so under the bill the Congress passes. I do not mean that W. P. A. workers will be set to making guns, planes, engines, tanks, or battle-ships. For the most part, they are not trained for that type

of work. But they can—they have demonstrated that they can—work on projects which are vital for our national defense. They can work on airports, on roads, on barracks, on armories, on warehouses, on rifle ranges, on Army and Navy bases.

It seems to me poor economy, from any point of view, to limit the number of people to be employed on the W. P. A. program to less than 3,000,000 and thus retard our defense program. If someone should ask me, "Can we afford it?" I would answer, "Can we afford not to do it?" If we cannot afford to look after our own democratic system and our own people who are in real jeopardy, then we had better really be concerned for our safety as an independent Nation.

Mr. President, let me warn this body, with all the force my meager ability is capable of, that the safety and security of the United States does not rest alone in a great mechanized army or a super navy. Without a loyal, patriotic citizenry armaments will prove to be a futile means of preserving the Nation. "An army in overalls," as one thoughtful editor says, "is today as essential to national preparedness as an army in uniform." By arms alone, absolutely indispensable though they are, neither this Nation nor any other can make itself secure. A nation, however highly armed, must have a sound internal policy or it will find itself at last in mortal peril.

The great threat to the security and happiness of our country rests today in the battalions of our unemployed. It rests in the millions of men, women, and children menaced by poverty and ill health. No powerful combination of warlike nations can threaten the United States half so seriously as those conditions which are of our own making. Let us, therefore, arm now against this dangerous enemy within our gates which threatens to undermine our country. Put these unemployed to work on our defense program and block the development of "fifth column" activities at home while we face the danger of a ruthless enemy abroad. That is the American way of meeting this issue.

I have concluded my discussion of the first amendment which I have presented. I will now refer to my second amendment. My second proposal concerns itself with the administrative expenses of the W. P. A. My proposal is to set a flat maximum of 5 percent of the total for the administration of the program.

The W. P. A. is a huge and complex agency. It has offices in every State and city in the United States. It works on every conceivable type of public project. It is the largest employer of labor in the United States, and yet we expect this agency to operate the vast program efficiently and intelligently on a shoestring. Every year we increase their burdens, and every year, instead of raising their administrative budget, we cut it.

During this fiscal year the W. P. A. is operating on the basis of 3.7 percent for administrative expense, yet the House proposes to cut this small item by 20 percent. To me, this seems like poor business. The purpose of the cut is obvious to all. It is designed to hamstring and discredit the W. P. A. The proponents talk piously of economy, while Mussolini-like, they stick the harpoon into the body of W. P. A.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. As the Senator knows, the W. P. A. has been reducing its expenses. In some years past, in relief bills, we established a maximum of 4 percent for administrative expenses, which the W. P. A. said was adequate. Then the percentage was reduced. This year the House cut 10 percent from the Budget figures. The Senate committee recommended the restoration of the Budget figure, which the W. P. A. says will be adequate, although it will have to be economical and careful. The percentage is about 3.7 percent. We have felt that the W. P. A. would not be willing to cut its forces below the number needed.

Mr. MURRAY. I am glad to hear the distinguished Senator from Colorado make that explanation. I am not familiar with the hearings, but I know that the Senator from Colorado is very familiar with the W. P. A. I am very glad

to know that he has given consideration to that point, and that the Senate committee has restored the cut which was made in the House. However, in view of the fact that we have placed additional burdens on the W. P. A. in the way of making additional reports and investigations, which I shall mention later, I still think we should to some degree at least increase the administrative expenses of that organization. I do not think the Administrator would ask for an increase unless he thought it was necessary.

About the time the hearings were in progress I called up the W. P. A. office, and I understood at that time that the W. P. A. was greatly injured by the attempt to reduce its administrative expenses. That was the reason why I became interested in the matter. I want the administration to be efficient and the program effective.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that following the address of the Senator from Montana, and during the further consideration of the joint resolution now under consideration, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 30 minutes on the joint resolution or any amendment thereto.

Mr. McNARY. On the joint resolution or any amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. On the joint resolution or any amendment.

Mr. McNARY. That would allow an hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. It would allow an hour if any Senator should wish to use an hour.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MEAD in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask any Senator or any industrialist if 5 percent of the total appropriation to operate a program as far flung and complicated as is the W. P. A. is too much. I invite comparison with any other governmental agency—or, for that matter, with any private agency—to prove whether or not the administrative expense allowed W. P. A. is pitifully insufficient.

In 1937 *Fortune* magazine conducted an extensive research into the operations of W. P. A. Certainly no one would suspect that magazine of bias in favor of this Federal agency. Let me quote from the editor of *Fortune*, discussing its survey:

One conclusion of this research will perhaps startle you.

Says *Fortune*.

This impartial and wholly unbiased survey gave strongest support to the feeling that the machinery of the damned and despised W. P. A. functions with an efficiency of which any industrialist would be proud.

We expect the W. P. A. to make periodic surveys of the needs of its workers. We tell it that it must not employ aliens, Communists, or members of the Nazi bund, and we expect it to carry out these provisions to the letter. We chastise it, and cry "boondoggling" whenever we find a W. P. A. project, no matter how small, which to us seems poorly handled. We expect the W. P. A. to eradicate all political influence on its projects. We expect every project to be well planned before work starts. We expect the W. P. A. engineers to make periodic inspections to see that the jobs are progressing on schedule. It must apportion its funds in an equitable manner. It must be sure that no work is done on private property. It must arrange for sponsors' contributions. It must make thousands of reports—to the Treasury Department, to the Attorney General's office, to the Comptroller General's office, to the President, and to the Congress. It must be sure that every proposed project is socially worth while. It must be sure that suitable labor is available before a project begins. It must watch each project closely, so that the final costs do

not exceed the initial estimates. I do not say that all these things should not be done. What I do say is that we should give the W. P. A. sufficient money so that they can be done properly. By so doing, in the long run we should save money.

The average W. P. A. administrative wage is considerably less than the average Government wage. I do not know why that should be. The jobs of W. P. A. administrators are just as difficult, if not more so, just as important, as those of any other bureau or agency. Yet we persist in underpaying them. I am familiar with the W. P. A. situation in my own State, as other Senators no doubt are familiar with the situation in their States. I know that the administrative staffs in the State office and in the district offices are made up of hard-working, intelligent men and women. I know, too, that they are underpaid, understaffed, and overworked. I do not think we should practice economy in that way. I predict that if we increase W. P. A. administrative expense to 5 percent of the total appropriated, we shall have a more efficient and effective W. P. A. program.

Mr. President, we are today facing a crisis in this country caused by the tragic international situation. Democracy is on trial as never before. We must think seriously of what we are doing. This is no time for dilly-dallying, for bickering, or for political pettifoggery and deception. We must get down to brass tacks, and do so promptly. We must consolidate all our forces. We must give work to our unemployed, so that they may play an important role in our defense program. We can no longer sit back and merely say, "Nobody in this country will starve." This is a negative attitude, and it is not enough. Besides, malnutrition, discouragement, and poverty may be just as devastating as starvation. What we should say is, "Let every American produce his or her share for the national defense and general welfare of the Nation. Let every man and woman become a part of our American defense program and a part of our society." We must provide the unemployed the opportunity to participate in this program—not as charity, but because they need work, and because we need their loyalty and patriotism.

Mr. President, there can be no safety or security for a nation infected by the dangerous plague of unemployment and destitution. We have millions of unemployed workers who are able and willing to work. It seems to me only logical that we should utilize these workers, as far as possible, in our national defense program. By providing useful—nay, essential—work for 3,000,000 of our unemployed fellow citizens through the W. P. A. program, we shall go a long way toward providing genuine national defense, both within and without our borders. We shall have provided insurance against communism or totalitarianism. We shall have reunited our country and our people and strengthened our democracy, and we shall be able to face the whole world without fear.

ATTITUDE OF AMERICA TOWARD EUROPEAN WAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour, I think we cannot finish the joint resolution tonight; and inasmuch as we have already secured a limitation on debate, it may be advisable to have it go over.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is the Senator about to move a recess?

Mr. BARKLEY. I was about to do so; yes.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator allow me 5 or 6 minutes before he does that?

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the leader for his kindness.

Mr. President, I have just learned through newspaper sources that the city of Paris is practically on the verge of capitulation—news which, I am sure, must bring tears to the eyes of the Members of this body and to the American people.

No wonder the Premier of France addressed to the President of the United States the plaintive appeal which is carried in this afternoon's newspapers, reading as follows:

Mr. President, I wish first of all to express my gratitude for the generous aid which you have decided to give us in the matter of aviation and armament.

For the past 6 days and 6 nights our divisions have been fighting without an hour's respite against an army having crushing numerical and material superiority. Today the enemy is near the gates of Paris.

We are fighting in front of Paris, we are fighting behind Paris, we are inclosing ourselves in one of our provinces and if we are chased therefrom we shall go to North Africa and if necessary to our American possessions.

REYNAUD JOINS ARMY

Part of the government has already left Paris. I myself am getting ready to leave for the armies. This is to intensify the struggle with all our forces we still have and not to abandon the fight.

May I request, Mr. President, that you explain all that to your people, to all American citizens, telling them that we are determined to sacrifice ourselves in the struggles we are leading for all free men.

At the moment I speak to you another dictatorship has hit France in the back. A new frontier is menaced. A naval battle is about to begin. You generously replied to the appeal I launched a few days ago over the Atlantic. Today, June 10, 1940, it is new aid, even wider, that it is my duty to ask of you.

At the same time that you expose the situation to the men and women of America I beg you publicly to declare United States' accord with the Allies and moral and material aid by all possible means excepting the dispatch of an expeditionary corps.

I beg you to do this before it is too late.

I realize the gravity of such a gesture. The gravity necessitates that it does not come too late.

You, yourself, said on October 5, 1937: "I am compelled and you are compelled to look ahead. The peace, freedom, and security of 90 percent of the world population begins to be jeopardized by the remaining 10 percent who are threatening to break down all international law."

"Surely the 90 percent who want to live in accordance with the moral standards that have received almost universal acceptance through centuries can and must find some way to make their will prevail."

The hour has come for these 90 percent of the citizens of the world to unite against the mortal danger menacing all. I have confidence in the solidarity of the American people, in this vital battle the Allies are waging for their own salvation, but also for the salvation of American democracy.

Mr. President, a few days ago prominent Members of this body were heard to say that the Allies had not requested aid of the American people. If anybody ever had a doubt that any of the other sentiments coming appealingly across the water were not official in character and did not come from the hearts of the Allied governments, that doubt is now definitely dispelled beyond question by the direct appeal made to the head of our Government by the Premier of the Republic of France.

Mr. President, it will be noted, in the alternative presented by the Premier of France, that yet closer and closer to our own continent, and closer and closer to our own country, comes the reach of the wings of this vicious vulture of war. There are growing up in our Congress those who, I can see, already are becoming the champions of the philosophy of appeasement in America. They say, "We are too weak, and therefore we had better not antagonize Hitler." They say, "Wait awhile, and perhaps he will spend his force and be exhausted so that he cannot get out of the Old World." They say, "Wait awhile yet, and perhaps he will not attack this continent. Wait awhile, until we are stronger and surer that we can resist defensively any encroachment he may hurl upon us."

Yesterday another important speech was made, Mr. President. It was made by the head of the Government of Brazil. That speech spoke complementarily and approvingly of the virility of the new governments and peoples. That must have had an ominous sound to the ears of every Member of this body and every citizen of this country. Either that speech indicated that the head of the Government of Brazil—one of the major republics of the 21 on this continent—was already, in faith and in philosophy, at one with the opponents of democracy, or he must have thought there was a sentiment of that character so strong in his own country that he was obligated to recognize it at a time when he paid some tribute to the democracies.

I wonder, Mr. President, where these champions of appeasement are going to make their stand.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator pardon me for just a moment? If not on the Rhine, if not at the Meuse, at the Somme, at the Seine, on the Loire, at Paris, at Tours; not in

Europe, if not in South America, where do the champions of appeasement propose to say, "Here we stand," and fight as men who were worthy always have fought for the things they held dear?

There seems to be a growing conspiracy in certain places to denounce some of us, and the President of the United States, and the Democratic Party under its present leadership, as being a war group and a war party. That policy is too obvious, Mr. President, for its slimy trail not to be odiously observable to everyone of us. Let history decide who is the war party of America. Let history decide who spills the blood of American boys. Let history decide whether the battle might have been avoided, but by the appeasement champions was ultimately and inevitably brought to the shores of this country they profess to love.

So I say, Mr. President, that appeasement is a germ which destroys the red corpuscles of every body politic in which it has been permitted to live.

If our body politic, if our Government, is once infected with that virus, it, too, will go the way of all others which have nourished it hospitably in their blood.

So, as Paris is about to fall, as the battle moves down to one of the provinces of France, as the government turns its eyes to the nations of the world appealing for succor, not for troops—and I cannot make it too clear that no Senator on this floor would more definitely vote against that than I would—appealing to this Government for what aid it can render short of war, if this Government now, in this crucial hour, fails to heed that plaintive appeal from the heart of crucified and expiring France, Mr. President, it not only constitutes ingratitude for what France did for us in an earlier day when we appealed to them, but it will mark the day when we choose to forfeit our standing in the family of the respected peoples of the world.

If we now decline to espouse a cause in which we profess to believe, and those who are our first line of defense there will come eventually the terrible day of realization that the champions of Chamberlainian appeasement led us not to peace but to a ghastly war in this hemisphere, if not in our country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I sought to interrupt the Senator in order that I might ask him a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was prompted to interrupt by his reference to the recent remarks of the President of Brazil. I have not had opportunity of reading the entire text of what the Brazilian executive said. I wonder whether the Senator from Florida has had that opportunity.

Mr. PEPPER. I regret to say that I have read only the newspaper accounts of it; I have not read the entire text.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thought that was probably the case, and that is what prompts me to say that perhaps it would be a little bit premature to pass judgment now upon the full meaning and the full significance of what President Vargas actually said.

I think that what has been printed may justify the conclusion, not that he has expressed any hostility toward or any doubt in the virtue of democracy, but, rather, that he has expressed an opinion that organization is needed to protect and promote democracy. I felt, perhaps, it would be well for us to withhold judgment before expressing on this floor an opinion about a speech the meaning of which certainly cannot be clear to us until we have read the entire speech.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I appreciate the spirit of caution which is contained in the words of the able Senator and my friend from Wyoming. No Senator on this floor is a greater admirer of the Government of Brazil than I—its very splendid and able Ambassador to Washington and his lovely wife, and its foreign minister, whom I was privileged to meet upon his last visit to this country. No one has looked with greater approval upon the spirit of cordiality and cooperation with which Brazil has entered into the family of nations constituting the 21 American republics. But in these crucial times we need more plain speaking than less, and the sentiments uttered by the President of Brazil were extremely

disturbing to me either way, whether they indicated the sentiment of the President himself as giving approval to the totalitarian philosophies because of their vigor and efficacy, or whether he thought it necessary, because there are more than a million Germans in Brazil who are quite an influential factor in its population, to express approval of the totalitarian philosophies. Either, I say, has an ominous sound in the ears of the other republics of this hemisphere.

I certainly hope and pray that the sentiments in the hearts of the people of Brazil will always be the sentiments of democracy, but this is no time to talk of appeasement with totalitarianism, and if our friends to the south of us are beginning to appease the dictators, beginning to speak well of them, to be cordial and hospitable to the receipt of their doctrines and their philosophy, it is time we knew it now, because there may come a time when the United States will have to know who are its friends and who are its enemies.

What I am appealing for is that the Congress of the United States shall stand up unafraid and say, "We denounce totalitarianism, we denounce Hitler, we denounce Mussolini, we declare anew our sentiments of democracy and Americanism, we reaffirm our Monroe Doctrine, we propose to give all aid short of war to the Allies now, beginning now, not tomorrow; and tomorrow giving yet more material aid as our capacity expands."

The Congress, however, has not even the courage to stand up and utter those sentiments. We quibble, we equivocate, we evade, we hesitate, we wait; and even the Congress does not stand up and say, "Hitler stinks in democracy's nostrils, and so does his ally and confederate in crime, Mussolini; and so do their philosophies, and all they stand for." We cannot even get the Senate to say that. Therefore I should not be very much surprised if, knowing the Senate of the United States will not say that, the President of Brazil, a country in which there are over a million German citizens, will not dare to say it. So as he stands on a battleship speaking of the glories of Brazil in times past, of victories won, he thinks he had better put in a good word for the dictators, because Hitler is at the gates of Paris, and the great Italian air force and Army are poised ready to strike. The dictators are about to win, the democracies are decadent, are afraid, they cannot make up their minds, and they let Chamberlains lead them. They will not say what they think, for to do so might make some dictator angry.

If that is the kind of example the American Congress is going to set the South American republics, if their ambassadors are going to be able to tell their people, "Roosevelt has gone away out in front, and he has himself out on a limb, but you don't hear much from Congress, do you? They have not said these things"—do you not think they will all begin to say, "We had better play up to Hitler a little"? Then the next time they make a speech they will say, "While we appreciate the sentiments of democracy, we cannot withhold our compliments from the new virility and the new faith."

That is the trouble; if the dictators win, if Paris falls, and France is destroyed, how long do you suppose these smaller countries are going to stand up when Herr Hitler says, "All right. I want your wheat; I want your cattle; I want your land; I want your cotton, and here are goods in return," and we, through our State Department, say, "Don't deal with Hitler. You are playing up to the totalitarian philosophy. You are making it impossible for these nations ever to restore themselves to power."

Do you think they are going to listen to us? They will not listen to a democracy that is afraid to say anything as against Hitler, who is neither afraid to say nor to do what his beastly will may dictate. So that the time has come when we would better make up our minds whether we are going to set an example of courage, or whether, in our equivocation, under the leadership of the champions of appeasement, we will give fearful and costly encouragement to the dictators.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am rather sorry I interrupted the Senator now, because I think it provoked

him to make even a more grave charge against the leader of a great American republic than he had previously made.

The point I offer is that the Senator has not read the speech of President Vargas. It seems to me it is inadvisable, at least, for any Member of this body to link the leader of an American republic with the leaders of totalitarian states abroad, because it is possible that if the Senator had had the opportunity of reading the entire speech, a different conclusion might have been drawn. I do not pretend to say that President Vargas agrees with the opinion expressed by the Senator from Florida, but I do say that it behooves us, sitting in this Chamber, to speak with caution about the opinions expressed by leaders of other American republics until we know definitely what those opinions are.

I can sympathize completely with the Senator's denunciation of totalitarianism. I can sympathize, and I do, with his repudiation of the philosophy which is guiding Hitler and Mussolini; but I am not yet ready to link any American President with either of those two dictators, and I believe that the evidence is not at hand to justify any Senator to link them together. That is the only reason I interrupted the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed—

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to make an observation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. While we are denouncing Hitler and Mussolini, I think we ought to include Mr. Stalin, of Russia. I think Stalin is accomplishing as much devilment in this country as is anyone else.

In view of the fact that my distinguished friend the Senator from Florida made mention of the South American situation, which really is a very serious one, and naturally an extremely interesting one, I now ask, without comment, to have published in the RECORD at this point, in connection with the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming, an editorial which I read this afternoon, appearing in the Washington Daily News.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of June 13, 1940]

TNT—THE MONROE DOCTRINE TODAY

Among Latin American nations Brazil has long been regarded as the most friendly to the United States. Over the years her foreign policy has frequently been deliberately aligned with our own. Hence the shock resulting from Tuesday's pro-Fascist speech at Rio of her dictator President, Getulio Vargas.

Defending "vigorous peoples," Vargas attacked the "sterile demagoguery of political democracy." Since this may mean us, it again becomes necessary that we take another look at our political hand. Once more it looks as though loose talk in Washington may have gotten us into a tight spot abroad.

A few days ago a congressional resolution dramatized the Monroe Doctrine as a war issue in these words:

"The United States would not recognize any transfer and would not acquiesce in any attempt to transfer any geographic region of the Western Hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power."

The resolution's threat, pointed at Germany, is substantially what Monroe said in different words back in 1823 when the target was France, Spain, and the Holy Alliance. "Not acquiesce in" are fighting words. Considering the amount of armament we have "on order" and the amount we have "on hand," fighting words do not appeal to us as much as preparedness actions.

Frankly, we think the whole subject of the Monroe Doctrine is loaded with political TNT; that it is a little known but widely misunderstood document that may very easily involve us in trouble more quickly than some of the more obvious threats. It is our baby. Latin America has never adopted it, seldom liked it, and has generally hated it. For us to assume that the nations south of the Rio Grande have changed their views overnight is at least naive.

There are many scars. Dollar diplomacy, 30 invasions by us into the internal affairs of 9 supposedly sovereign and independent Latin American nations, the story of how we got the Panama Canal, the activities of our marines in Central America and the Caribbean—a long and often sordid tale of the build-up over a century of distrust and suspicion of Yankee imperialism.

President Roosevelt, by his good-neighbor policy, has made a commendable effort to heal old wounds. But he was dealing with a Latin psychology and Latin suspicions. The best that has eventuated from conferences at Buenos Aires, Lima, and Panama, conferences designed to make the Monroe Doctrine a real pan-American

doctrine, has been an agreement to confer when danger threatens anywhere in this hemisphere—as would be the case in any attempt, for instance, to transfer the Dutch West Indies from a conquered Holland to a conquering Germany.

But there is a tremendous gap between agreeing to confer and agreeing to act. Since by the congressional resolution we are committed to action, we may have assistance or we may have only conferees. As a result of talking first, Congress has saddled us with a responsibility that stretches from pole to pole, from ocean to ocean, and from hell to breakfast—without any assurance that President Vargas, or any of his fellow Latin American dictators and presidents, includes us in his group of vigorous peoples.

Question: Why should we be the I'll-help-youse Happy Hooligan of the Americas? If the Monroe Doctrine idea—when the show-down comes—can't be turned into an iron-clad, mutually respected military alliance, then why should we stick our neck out way down south of the Equator?

Suggestion: Cut out the conversation and the resolving. Call a conference, or page every nation in Latin America, and find how far, if at all, each of them is willing to go in a move for the joint protection of the Western Hemisphere—a move which would be the common task of all, not the self-imposed but deeply resented task of Uncle Sam.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. So that the day-to-day record may be duly kept up to date, let me call the attention of my brethren to the fact that a few days ago that great diurnal, the Washington Star, published a very interesting news story by one of its contributors, pointing out that a few years ago German military experts came to this country and made a very careful examination of our mobilization plans, as a result of which Germany adopted the mobilization plans of the War Department of the United States of America, and is now employing them in its successful "blitzkrieg" against France, Belgium, Holland, and Great Britain. Therefore, when we hear totalitarianism savagely denounced on this floor we can all say, "Amen" to the denunciation, but hope to God that we will never have to adopt the things that Hitler adopted after looking over our plans.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. I am reluctant to say anything at this late hour, but it seems to me that in the remarks of the Senator from Florida are some things to which exception should be taken.

The Senator denounces those whom he criticizes as the "apostles of appeasement." There is no occasion for appeasement on the part of America. Appeasement comes into play when there is controversy, when there is difference. There are some who are apostles of peace rather than of appeasement. I say to Senators that what America wants is peace. What American citizens—men, women, and the young folks—want is peace, but the very things that are being said on this floor, and elsewhere, by public officials, are jeopardizing the peace of America.

As a citizen I am interested in peace. As the father of two sons of military age I am interested in peace. I am not willing, without entering my protest, that everyone who insists that America go its way and mind its own business should be denounced. I am unwilling to have those denounced who, like myself, think we should not participate in the affairs of Europe. I have sat here day by day and heard made various speeches which apparently sought to create such a situation that America would not have a single friend in the association of nations. One Senator denounces Germany, another Senator denounces Italy and its leaders, another denounces England, another denounces France, another denounces Russia. We leave no nation undenounced.

My judgment is that in the affairs of nations, as in the affairs of men, friends are what count, not enemies. We may disapprove, we do disapprove, we abhor what is going on in Europe, but how many American boys are we willing to throw upon the altar of martial sacrifice in order that affairs in Europe may be conducted and regulated as you and I would have them conducted and regulated? I say, unfortunate, disastrous, distressing, and tragic as are conditions in Europe, I am not willing to have the Senate of the

United States or the Government of the United States take a position or move forward in a way that will cost the life of a single American boy. It is for peace, not appeasement, I speak.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it the friendship of Hitler the Senator wants to retain?

Mr. ADAMS. I am not interested in his friendship, but I am not trying to incur his enmity. I would rather have Hitler's good will than his ill will. There is no reason to go out and invite danger. There is no reason to denounce ideas or ideologies which we do not like. In other words, I am interested in the welfare of this country. I am interested in the men, in the women, and in the boys of this country.

I fear that the things the Senator from Florida says are nothing more nor less than a demand that America go into war. We cannot go as far as we choose and then say, "No, we were not making war." In time of war we cannot say to one side, "We will give you everything we have; we will do everything short of war for you," and then expect the other party to say, "Of course, inasmuch as you say that what you do is not war, it is not war." You can go so far, but if you go beyond that you drag and you drive and you impel war upon us. That is what we want to avoid.

I merely differ with the conclusions which the Senator from Florida draws; I am afraid he is talking war when he means peace.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2598. An act for the relief of Kurt Wessely;

S. 3196. An act to amend the act approved May 24, 1938, entitled "An act for the relief of the Comision Mixta Demarcadora de Limites Entre Colombia y Panama" and for the relief of Jose Antonio Sossa D;

S. 4026. An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the Bureau of Labor Statistics to collect information as to amount and value of all goods produced in State and Federal prisons.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not yield further.

I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported favorably the nomination of Frank C. Blackford, of New York, to be United States marshal for the western district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Cullen Ganey to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Campbell White to act as diplomatic agent and consul general at Tangier, Morocco.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc. That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 14, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 13 (legislative day of May 28), 1940

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

J. Cullen Ganey to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John Campbell White to act as diplomatic agent and consul general at Tangier, Morocco.

POSTMASTERS

ARIZONA

William I. Welker, Bowle.
James A. Metzger, Grand Canyon.

ARKANSAS

Sarah Abington, Beebe.
William Earl Polk, Corning.
Charles Roy Wise, Thornton.

LOUISIANA

Mary K. Roark, Marion.

MAINE

Ralph H. McEwen, Bowdoinham.
Wilbur F. Goodwin, Kennebunk Port.
Alice S. Fitzgerald, Smyrna Mills.
Clara M. Colcord, Stockton Springs.

MASSACHUSETTS

John Robert Crowley, Monson.

MICHIGAN

Clara C. Hollister, Bronson.
Ralph Edward Peterson, Frankfort.
Roland J. Boudreau, Garden.
Gordon M. Gould, Lawrence.
Charles S. Clark, Jr., St. Johns.

MONTANA

Emma M. Minette, Cut Bank.

TEXAS

Oliver A. Hale, Abilene.
Peter Hilton Williams, Albany.
Zack Thomason Burkett, Archer City.
Edith M. Bursey, Brackettville.
Alvin Henry Lohofener, Burkburnett.
Odis A. Brown, Eliasville.
Oliver P. Ford, Fabens.
Lizzie Crawford, Marathon.
John M. Meiners, Moulton.
Wade W. Barnett, Oakwood.
Cora Read, Plains.
Marcus E. Jud, Riesel.
Hattie Waller, Trinity.
Jennie C. Jenkins, Tuscola.
Edwin C. Dickschat, Washington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, with the light of this day, renew the sunlight of our spirits and the childhood of our hearts. Remind us that life is redeemed by sacrifice and service. Revive within us the sympathy that feels another's grief and shares another's gladness. The Lord help us to forgive that we may be forgiven; cleanse Thou us from secret faults. Grant that our faith in God, in man, and in our country may never die away. We earnestly pray Thee to give our national life a deeper, richer tone that preserves us from those powers of chaos and anarchy which are darker than unstreaked midnight. Thou hast made everything beautiful in Thy time, fair and sublime forms, yielding us their wealth as we pause to listen to their whispers. We praise Thee, our Father, that there is still something beyond, better than bread, more radiant than June skies, more blessed than the silences at twilight; something that urges us to bow and pray: Bless Thou the truth to us, dear Lord, as Thou didst bless the bread by Galilee. In the name of our dear Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 277. Joint resolution making an appropriation to control the chinch-bug menace in the Corn Belt.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3196. An act to amend the act approved May 24, 1938, entitled "An act for the relief of the Comision Mixta Demarcadora de Limites Entre Colombia y Panama" and for the relief of Jose Antonio Sossa D.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4026) entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 18, 34, 50, 63, 64, 69, 85, 100, 101, and 111 to the bill (H. R. 8745) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes," and that the Senate recedes from its amendments numbered 95 and 110 to said bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Richard L. Neuberger.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and at this point to include a very short letter from the New York State Federation of Labor concerning Senate bill 591.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say that under the agreement entered into in reference to extension of remarks everything except the remarks of the Member will have to go in the Appendix.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I will modify my request and ask that it be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to insert a telegram from a group of editors in the State of Minnesota on adjournment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include copies of diplomatic letters from the Polish Legation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELSON]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, let us keep the record straight. On June 7, in an extended article in the press, President Roosevelt informed Democratic leaders that it was imperative that Congress adjourn by June 22. On June 12, when signing the Navy fund bill, he stated he saw no reason for Congress to remain in session more than 10 days or a fortnight.

Yesterday, in his able address on the floor of the House, the gentleman from Virginia, Congressman WOODRUM, said that Congress should remain in session in accordance with the unanimous vote of the Virginia delegation. He also stated he was very glad to see in the press a statement correcting an article of a few days ago saying that the President wanted Congress to get out of Washington. While I have searched the papers with care, I do not find any reference to the change of mind on the part of the President. He certainly wanted Congress out of his way, but now that public opinion has been aroused by the Republicans against adjournment, he is running to cover.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, when gentlemen quote the President as saying he wanted Congress to get out of town or he wanted it to adjourn, they are quoting something that never happened. The President never made any such statement to the press or anybody else.

There has been a great deal of talk about adjournment. It reminds me of a certain bug that looks one way and pushes another. A great many gentlemen talk against adjournment, but it would be my opinion that a great many of them, if there was a secret ballot, would vote to adjourn by an overwhelming majority. Under the circumstances, however, I think I may state that in all probability all gentlemen will have all the time to stay in Washington this summer that they desire. [Applause.]

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2803 (C) AND 2903 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 9909,

to amend sections 2803 (c) and 2903 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Massachusetts explain what this bill is?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; this is a bill reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee. Under the present law, over the top of a bottle of distilled liquors is placed a strip stamp that costs 1 cent apiece to purchase. Of course, the regular tax is paid on the liquor. This strip is for the protection of the revenue, and also to protect the purchaser against poor and bootlegged liquor. If those stamps are damaged, for example by water, a refund can be made, or they may be redeemed by an equivalent amount of stamps, but if completely destroyed, for example by fire, the purchaser then must sustain a complete loss.

A distillery purchased \$4,500 worth of these stamps. There was a fire. These stamps, incidentally, are under the control of the Government at all times. The distiller has to get an order from the storekeeper-gager at his plant to buy a certain number of stamps. He has to go to the collector, present the order, and when the collector sells the stamps to him they are not delivered to the distiller or to his representative, but delivery is made to the storekeeper-gager. So at all times the Government knows what stamps have been issued, and what stamps have been used. This is simply to allow the Government to reimburse either in money or by the issuance of additional stamps in lieu of those actually destroyed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is no chance for fraud, is there?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; because the Government has complete control at all times. When the stamps are sold they are sold only upon the order of the storekeeper-gager at the plant, and the stamps are delivered to the storekeeper-gager, who is an employee of the Government. The Government is in control of the stamps at all times and has a record of them at all times.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, may I say that this bill comes here with the unanimous report of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2803 (c), Internal Revenue Code, be amended to read as follows:

"(c) Unused stamps; exchange, refund, etc.: The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, under regulations prescribed by him and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, may redeem or make allowance for any unused stamps issued under section 203 of the Liquor Taxing Act of 1934 or subsection (b) of this section by exchanging them for other stamps of the same kind or by refunding moneys received therefor: *Provided*, That stamps may be exchanged or the value thereof refunded only in quantities of the value of \$5 or more: *And provided further*, That no claim for the exchange of strip stamps or refund therefor shall be allowed unless presented within 2 years after the date on which such stamps were lawfully issued. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this provision."

SEC. 2. Section 2903, Internal Revenue Code, is hereby amended by relettering subsections (e), (f), and (g) as (f), (g), and (h), respectively, and by inserting a new subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) Unused stamps; exchange, refund, etc.: The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, under regulations prescribed by him and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, may redeem or make allowance for any unused case stamp, with all coupon strip stamps attached thereto, issued under section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to allow the bottling of distilled spirits in bond,' approved March 3, 1897 (29 Stat. 626), or under said section 1, as variously amended, and may redeem or make allowance for unused strip stamps issued for bottles of distilled spirits bottled in bond under said section 1, as amended by the act of July 9, 1937 (50 Stat. 487), or under subsection (d) of this section, by exchanging them for strip stamps for bottled-in-bond spirits, or

by refunding moneys received therefor: *Provided*, That stamps may be exchanged or the value thereof refunded only in quantities of the value of \$5 or more: *And provided further*, That no claim under this subsection for redemption or allowance in respect of case or strip stamps shall be allowed unless presented within 2 years after the date on which such case or strip stamps were lawfully issued. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out this provision."

Sec. 3. Notwithstanding the limitations contained in sections 2803 (c) and 2903 (e), Internal Revenue Code, as amended and inserted, respectively, by this act, as to the time within which claims under such sections must be presented, claims under such sections for the exchange of or refund for stamps lawfully issued prior to the date of enactment of this act may be allowed if presented within 2 years from the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Nation magazine by Richard L. Neuberger of the Portland Oregonian in reference to the Grand Coulee Dam and the Columbia Basin project.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

DISPOSITION OF CONDEMNED ORDNANCE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7074) to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective departments, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 2, after "Republic," insert "posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky explain this bill and the amendment?

Mr. MAY. The original House bill merely authorized the War and Navy Departments to make sales of surplus guns and other material to the American Legion Posts. The Senate added the posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is obsolete material?

Mr. MAY. Yes, obsolete material.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thought you were sending all that over to help in the fight across the waters.

Mr. MAY. We are keeping a little of it for these posts, to keep their patriotism up, too, like mine and that of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the result of a poll.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a brief poem, The Two Altars.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the June issue of World Affairs, organ of the American Peace Society.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an able address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a few brief suggestions on preparedness by the editor of my largest newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two resolutions, one from the city of Santa Monica with reference to national preparedness, and one from Inglewood, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to read to the Members of the House the contents of a telegram received by me this morning from leading publishers and editors of trade magazines and leading citizens of the State of Minnesota:

The undersigned think it most important that Congress remain in session during the much-talked-of crisis, if one actually exists. We also regard the defense program as urgent, and earnestly ask your support. It is our opinion that if this country faces a great emergency, the blame rests directly upon a policy of meddling and of too intemperate talking. Let's set matters right in our own country before attempting world-wide reformation. We insist upon no foreign interference in this hemisphere. Why should we interfere in the affairs of Europe?

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the sentiments expressed in this communication.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked this morning to read in the Washington Post an Associated Press dispatch which quoted from the London Times as follows:

We have to appeal to our American friends for haste and yet more urgent haste. It is essential to send, and send immediately, every available unit that can by any means be equipped. This is a necessity, by common consent, that takes absolute precedence to the defense of these islands.

By what manner of reasoning should the London Times ask that the United States of America send units of their men over to fight on foreign fields? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include certain quotations from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which is in addition to the request I made a while ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have read a letter which was sent by our colleague the gentleman from Michigan to some of his colleagues in the Congress. I can hardly conceive that many of us will harbor the same sentiments that were expressed by him in that letter. I propose that hereafter, so that we can distinguish this particular missive from other missives, that we call it The Hymn of Hate by Hoffman.

Expressions such as were contained in that letter are a distinct disservice to the Government and to the people of this country. They retard the preparedness program, they promote and encourage "fifth column" activities, and I would say they do not discourage treason and disloyalty to the Government of the United States. I feel sure that there are very few Members of this Congress who will follow the suggestions made by the gentleman from Michigan, and I am sure that we Democrats on this side of the aisle will particularly watch to see if any Member of this body follows the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan. [Applause].

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, why should not President Roosevelt give the Congress the benefit and use of the War Resources Board report made last fall? The Board, appointed by the President and headed by Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., made a detailed study and report of the condition of our war resources. The main reason for the report was to have the facts in case an emergency should arise. Time and money have been spent to collect these facts. The Congress, and particularly the Military, Naval, and Appropriations Committees, whose duty it is to establish our military and naval policy, should have access to it. Why is it being held up?

What possible excuse can the President give for withholding this important data and refusing to turn the entire report over to the legislative branch of the Government during its consideration of our war resources for purposes of national defense?

There should be no partisanship in the question of preparedness and national defense, and all available facts should be presented to the Congress so as to expedite sound and necessary measures for the protection of the American people and the safeguarding of our national interests.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8913) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8913) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 29.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$1,256,920"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$122,080"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$148,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$16,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 17.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
J. O. FERNANDEZ,
JAMES MCANDREWS,
ROBERT F. RICH,

Managers on the part of the House.

M. E. TYDINGS,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
ALVA B. ADAMS,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
FREDERICK HALE,
STYLES BRIDGES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8913) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

On Nos. 1 to 15, inclusive: Provides certain small increases in salary to various employees of the Senate, the proposal to make such increases being concurred in by the House.

On No. 16: Appropriates \$2,000 for a contested-election case expenses as proposed by the Senate.

On Nos. 18, 20, 24, 25, and 26: Provides total increases of \$4,274 in appropriations for salaries of employees under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol in order that certain administrative promotions may be made. The House has concurred in the action of the Senate in providing these additional funds.

On No. 19: Eliminates, as proposed by the Senate, an appropriation of \$350,000, which had been provided by the House for reconstruction and repair of the terraces of the Capitol Building. The House managers recognize the need for this improvement work to be done but have deferred their approval thereof until next year in order that exclusive attention may be given to the sizable task of replacing the roofs on the House and Senate wings of the Capitol.

On Nos. 21 and 22: Appropriates \$306,745, as proposed by the Senate, for expenses of maintaining the Senate Office Building, instead of \$254,503 as provided by the House, and makes \$10,000 of this sum available for certain painting and \$5,000 for the purchase of rugs as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 23: Makes \$3,000 of the appropriation for maintenance of the Senate Office Building available for certain rewiring work in the Senate Office Building as proposed by the Senate.

On No. 27: Appropriates \$1,256,920 for salaries in the Library of Congress proper, instead of \$1,255,120, as proposed by the House, and \$1,263,420, as provided by the Senate.

On No. 28: Appropriates \$122,080 for salaries, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, instead of \$102,080, as proposed by the House, and \$142,080, as provided by the Senate.

On No. 29: Makes \$5,000 of the appropriation for acquisition of books, Library of Congress, available for traveling expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of \$10,000, as provided by the Senate.

On No. 30: Appropriates \$148,000 for purchase and acquisition of books for the Library of Congress, instead of \$118,000 as proposed by the House and \$158,000 as provided by the Senate.

On No. 31: Makes \$16,500 of the appropriation to provide books for the adult blind available for payment of personal services, instead of allowing \$13,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House and \$20,000 as provided by the Senate.

On No. 17, relating to the pay of the legislative counsel of the Senate, is reported as in disagreement.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
J. O. FERNANDEZ,
JAS. MCANDREWS,
ROBERT F. RICH,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I hate to have to take the floor and oppose a conference report of the legislative appropriation bill, but the situation is such that I feel most keenly that I would not be doing my duty if I did not call some attention to some of the things that have been going on. I hate to do this for another reason. I believe that, generally, the legislative appropriations subcommittee has done a very good job and has held things down and they have refused to stand for increases, but there is one particular item in connection with Senate Amendment No. 28 which I feel calls for attention. I feel that the membership of the House should have its attention called to this item which relates to the legislative-reference service.

I wonder how many Members of the House realize that there are in that set-up speech writers for Members of the House. Why, I am informed that two or three of them are accustomed to gather in one Member's office.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is the objection to telling us who it is?

Mr. TABER. Well, I am not going to do that right now, but I would say that these fellows have solicited the writing of speeches for Members.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman mean that some Member of the House has Government-paid officials writing his speeches for him, or assisting in the writing of them?

Mr. TABER. I do know they are soliciting the writing of speeches and they were asked why they did not go to me and ask me if they could not write my speeches and they said they would not dare.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. That probably accounts for the low order of speeches that are delivered on the other side. [Laughter.]

Mr. TABER. Well, I would not be surprised if some of the things that have happened here in the last year are due to that fact.

Now, the man in charge of this legislative reference service is Dr. Luther Evans. Dr. Evans was an instructor at Princeton until his communistic activities required his separation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In a moment, when I have finished this description.

He was then the head of the writers' project on the W. P. A., and anybody who would read the productions that that outfit got out would realize that he was a total failure in that job, and as a result of his being a total failure he qualified for appointment under the new Librarian last winter as Chief of the Legislative Reference Service.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In a moment, I will yield.

I wonder if the House wants that kind of stuff to go on. Personally, I do not.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Referring back to this speech-making, I hope and trust that none of this crowd is engaged in letter writing such as I have seen floating around here lately.

Mr. TABER. I do not know anything about letter writing. I can write my own letters and I hope the gentleman writes his.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there about the letter writing?

Mr. TABER. Well, I ought to yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. I suppose the remark of the gentleman refers to a letter that I wrote to the Republicans on the 5th of June, and which in some way came into the hands of somebody on the majority side. Now, you know that eavesdroppers and fellows who get somebody else's mail and then

have it reproduced and circulated never enjoy the contents; but I intend to take occasion before the session is over to give you the facts and show that the statements in the letter are true.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will say to the gentleman from Michigan that the Lord knows that nobody would ever accuse anybody else of writing such a letter but you.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And now, if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. May I have 1 minute more and I shall not yield further?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Oh, I could not do that without the permission of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. COCHRAN. But this is in reference to the speech that he is making concerning the conference report.

Mr. TABER. But I promised not to yield to anybody and to use it myself.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York provided he confines his argument to the bill.

Mr. TABER. Then I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the new Librarian was appointed, there came to my desk from the legislative reference service, prepared by them, a digest of bills. It was not really a digest, but simply an announcement of bills as contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I took that matter up with the new Librarian and called his attention to it, saying it was an absolute waste of money.

He agreed with me, and agreed it should be discontinued. I think if the gentleman will call to the attention of the new Librarian what he has just related, with reference to the legislative reference service, writing speeches for Members of Congress, that the new Librarian will see to it that they will stop writing speeches for Members of Congress or anybody else.

Mr. TABER. I would hope so, and wish I had warned the Librarian at the time he made this appointment of what he might expect. Approximately \$86,000 was asked of the House committee and the House committee did not give them any of it. The Senate committee gave \$42,000, and there is a compromise here of cutting the difference in two. Personally, I don't want to see this service have any more money and I am therefore opposed to this conference report. I hope that it will be rejected.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think that every Member of the House should contemplate the pending conference report, and particularly the bill, as constituted, in a rather profound and solemn way, because it is an echo from the past. This legislative bill is unlike any other appropriation bill that comes to the floor of this House. It is something of a landmark. It is like plunking a stone into the recesses of memory that go back for many years. The bill reminds me of that area around Dunkerque, France, where a great rear-guard action was fought to protect retreating troops, because this legislative bill is something like that. It is a vantage point from which we fight a rear-guard action as we seek to resist the administrative and procedural "blitzkrieg" that has been changing the appropriating procedure of Congress during the last 8 years. If you have noticed this legislative appropriation bill, it identifies particularly every employee and the salary he gets. It controls the expenditures of every committee, and indicates the number of employees that shall work for the House or the Senate, in the Botanic Gardens,

the Congressional Library, and elsewhere. But note the great departure there has been from this procedure. Pick up any other appropriation bill, and you will find a paragraph substantially as follows:

For salaries and administrative expenses, \$4,526,433—

Or some other like figure.

There is no mention of the number of employees.

There is no mention as to the salaries that each one shall receive; there is no mention of administrative promotions or otherwise. But in this bill everything is particularized. Once upon a time that was the procedure that was followed in every appropriation bill that came to this floor.

So I say that unlike the 12 or 13 regular, supplementary, and deficiency bills that find their way through the Congress in every session there stands out apart, and singularly apart, the legislative appropriation bill which still conforms to the old procedure. There is much to be said for it. We can control the expenditures of this Government. We can control particularly the administrative abuses if we would go back to that kind of procedure. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I think a brief explanation of the conference report will suffice as there were no items of real contention between the House and Senate.

The bill as finally approved by the conferees carries a total appropriation of \$23,671,220, which is a reduction of \$2,118,392 in the Budget estimates, or nearly a 9-percent reduction. It is with some pardonable pride that I point to this accomplishment in effecting these measurable savings in the appropriations for our own establishment, and it is at least evidence that Congress, although making tremendous appropriations for all other activities of Government, is most economical when it comes to making provision for itself. I think it might be appropriate to observe, as a testimonial of some kind or another to our work, that this conference report is the first conference report that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has seen fit to attach his name to within the last 2 years.

As a matter of collateral interest, I might say that I am planning to introduce within the next few days a concurrent resolution which proposes the creation of a joint House-Senate committee to study the pay rates of all the employees of the House and Senate with a view of establishing comparable rates of salary for comparable duties performed in each of the two Houses and with the further purpose of arriving at some formula for making regular promotions to employees of the legislative establishment, who, by dint of long and faithful service merit some such consideration being shown them.

Under the present system of making appropriations for the various administrative agencies, moneys that the administrative heads are able to save as a result of lapses in salary caused by deaths, resignations, or transfers of employees can be used to make administrative promotions of employees. The net result of this practice is to afford means for the regular and consistent promotion of personnel of the administrative branch of the Government. But contrast this procedure with the manner by which we make provision for the employees of the legislative branch. We have no system whatever for affording merited step-ups in salary to our personnel. Those employees that have the ear of an influential Member are frequently successful in having their salary increased, while other employees, not having avenues for a successful approach to their purpose of gaining additional compensation, are foreclosed from consideration. Some of the salaries paid in both the House and Senate are too high and should be reduced, although I do not believe that such reduction should affect the present incumbent of any such position. On the other hand, there are undoubtedly some positions being compensated for at entirely too low a level. The joint committee my resolution proposes to set up, can proceed to correct these inequities. The Senator from Maryland, Senator TYDINGS,

will introduce a resolution identical in terms in the Senate, and I sincerely hope that Congress will see fit to make provision for this study. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were ayes 86 and noes 48.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The roll call is automatic. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 240, nays 129, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 149]

YEAS—240

Allen, La.	Dickstein	Kefauver	Patton
Allen, Pa.	Dies	Keller	Pearson
Anderson, Mo.	Dingell	Kelly	Peterson, Fla.
Arnold	Dirksen	Kennedy, Martin	Peterson, Ga.
Ball	Disney	Kennedy, Md.	Pfeifer
Barnes	Doxey	Kennedy, Michael	Pierce
Barry	Duncan	Keogh	Pittenger
Beam	Dunn	Kerr	Poage
Beckworth	Eberharter	Kilday	Polk
Bell	Edelstein	Kitchens	Rabaut
Bland	Edmiston	Kleberg	Ramspeck
Bloom	Elliott	Kocalkowski	Randolph
Boehne	Ellis	Kramer	Rankin
Boland	Evans	Lanham	Rayburn
Boren	Faddis	Larrabee	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Fenton	Lea	Richards
Bradley, Pa.	Ferguson	Leavy	Robinson, Utah
Brewster	Fernandez	Lesinski	Rogers, Okla.
Brooks	Fitzpatrick	Lewis, Colo.	Romjue
Brown, Ga.	Flaherty	Luce	Ryan
Bryson	Flannery	Ludlow	Sabath
Buck	Ford, Miss.	Lynch	Sacks
Buckler, Minn.	Ford, Thomas F.	McAndrews	Sasscer
Buckley, N. Y.	Fries	McArdle	Schafer, Wis.
Bulwinkle	Fulmer	McCormack	Schuetz
Burgin	Garrett	McGehee	Schulte
Byrne, N. Y.	Gathings	McGranery	Schwert
Byrns, Tenn.	Gavagan	McKeough	Scrugham
Byron	Gearhart	McLaughlin	Secret
Caldwell	Gehrmann	McMillan, Clara	Shanley
Camp	Gerlach	McMillan, John L.	Shannon
Cannon, Mo.	Geyer, Calif.	Maciejewski	Sheppard
Carter	Gibbs	Mahon	Smith, Conn.
Cartwright	Gore	Maloney	Smith, Ill.
Casey, Mass.	Gossett	Mansfield	Smith, Maine
Celler	Grant, Ala.	Marcantonio	Smith, Wash.
Chapman	Green	Martin, Ill.	Smith, W. Va.
Church	Gregory	Mason	Snyder
Clark	Griffith	Massingale	Somers, N. Y.
Claypool	Hare	May	South
Cochran	Harrington	Mills, Ark.	Sparkman
Coffee, Nebr.	Hart	Mills, La.	Starnes, Ala.
Coffee, Wash.	Harter, Ohio	Mitchell	Sullivan
Cole, Md.	Havener	Moser	Sweet
Collins	Healey	Mouton	Tarver
Colmer	Hendricks	Murdock, Ariz.	Terry
Connery	Hennings	Myers	Thomas, Tex.
Cooper	Hill	Nelson	Thomason
Costello	Hobbs	Nichols	Van Zandt
Cravens	Hull	Norrell	Vinson, Ga.
Creal	Hunter	Norton	Voorhis, Calif.
Crowe	Izac	O'Connor	Wallgren
Crowther	Jarman	O'Day	Warren
Cullen	Johnson, Luther A.	O'Leary	Weaver
Cummings	Johnson, Lyndon	O'Neal	Welchel
D'Alessandro	Johnson, Okla.	O'Toole	Whittington
Davis	Johnson, W. Va.	Pace	Williams, Mo.
Delaney	Jones, Tex.	Parsons	Wolverton, N. J.
Dempsey	Kee	Patman	Woodruff, Mich.
DeRouen	Keefe	Patrick	Zimmerman

NAYS—129

Alexander	Bolles	Curtis	Gifford
Allen, Ill.	Boiton	Ditter	Gilchrist
Andersen, H. Carl	Bradley, Mich.	Dondero	Gillie
Andersen, A. H.	Brown, Ohio	Dworschak	Goodwin
Andrews	Carlson	Eaton	Graham
Angeli	Case, S. Dak.	Elston	Grant, Ind.
Arends	Chipperfield	Engel	Gross
Austin	Clason	Englebright	Guyner, Kans.
Barton, N. Y.	Clevenger	Fish	Gwynne
Bates, Mass.	Cluett	Ford, Leland M.	Hall, Edwin A.
Bender	Corbett	Gamble	Hall, Leonard W.
Blackney	Crawford	Gartner	Halleck

Hancock	Knutson	Reed, Ill.	Talle
Harness	Kunkel	Reed, N. Y.	Thill
Harter, N. Y.	Lambertson	Rees, Kans.	Thomas, N. J.
Hartley	Landis	Robison, Ky.	Thorkelson
Hawks	LeCompte	Rockefeller	Tibbott
Hinshaw	Lewis, Ohio	Rodgers, Pa.	Tinkham
Hoffman	McDowell	Rogers, Mass.	Treadway
Holmes	McGregor	Routzohn	Vorys, Ohio
Hope	McLean	Rutherford	Vreeland
Horton	McLeod	Sandager	Wadsworth
Jarrett	Marshall	Schiffler	Wheat
Jeffries	Martin, Iowa	Secombe	White, Ohio
Jenkins, Ohio	Martin, Mass.	Seger	Wigglesworth
Jensen	Michener	Short	Williams, Del.
Johns	Miller	Simpson	Winter
Johnson, Ill.	Monkiewicz	Smith, Ohio	Wolcott
Johnson, Ind.	Mundt	Springer	Wolfenden, Pa.
Jones, Ohio	Murray	Stearns, N. H.	Youngdahl
Jonkman	O'Brien	Stefan	
Kilburn	Oliver	Sumner, Ill.	
Kinzer	Powers	Taber	

NOT VOTING—62

Anderson, Calif.	Drewry	Merritt	Sumners, Tex.
Barden, N. C.	Durham	Monroney	Sutphin
Bates, Ky.	Fay	Mott	Sweeney
Burch	Flannagan	Murdock, Utah	Taylor
Burdick	Folger	Osmer	Tenerowicz
Cannon, Fla.	Hess	Plumley	Tolan
Cole, N. Y.	Hook	Rich	Vincent, Ky.
Cooley	Houston	Risk	Walter
Courtney	Jacobsen	Robertson	Ward
Cox	Jenks, N. H.	Satterfield	Welch
Crosser	Jennings	Schaefer, Ill.	West
Culkin	Kean	Shafer, Mich.	White, Idaho
Darden, Va.	Kirwan	Sheridan	Wood
Darrow	Lemke	Smith, Va.	Woodrum, Va.
Doughton	Maas	Spence	
Douglas	Magnuson	Steagall	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Fay (for) with Mr. Hess (against).
 Mr. Barden of North Carolina (for) with Mr. Mott (against).
 Mr. Woodrum of Virginia (for) with Mr. Culkin (against).
 Mr. Cooley (for) with Mr. Douglas (against).
 Mr. Merritt (for) with Mr. Cole of New York (against).
 Mr. Burch (for) with Mr. Maas (against).
 Mr. Doughton (for) with Mr. Jennings (against).
 Mr. Flannagan (for) with Mr. Kean (against).
 Mr. Satterfield (for) with Mr. Plumley (against).
 Mr. Drewry (for) with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire (against).
 Mr. Robertson (for) with Mr. Osmer (against).
 Mr. Smith of Virginia (for) with Mr. Shafer of Michigan (against).
 Mr. Darden of Virginia (for) with Mr. Anderson of California (against).
 Mr. Hook (for) with Mr. Darrow (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Cox with Mr. Welch.
 Mr. Durham with Mr. Burdick.
 Mr. Folger with Mr. Rich.
 Mr. West with Mr. Lemke.
 Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Risk.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Magnuson.
 Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Houston.
 Mr. Courtney with Mr. Wood.
 Mr. Spence with Mr. Monroney.
 Mr. Steagall with Mr. Taylor.
 Mr. Walter with Mr. Sheridan.
 Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Ward.
 Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Sweeney.
 Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Tenerowicz.
 Mr. Crosser with Mr. Murdock of Utah.
 Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Tolan.
 Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Bates of Kentucky.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 17: On page 26, line 22, after the word "Representatives", insert "Provided, That after the date of enactment of this act the rate of compensation of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate shall be the same as that of the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 17 and agree therein with an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 and agree to the same with the following amendment: Strike out all the matter inserted by said Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof the

following: "Provided, That hereafter the compensation of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate shall be at the rate of \$10,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEPORTATION OF HARRY RENTON BRIDGES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution No. 511.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 511

Resolved, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 9766, a bill to authorize the deportation of Harry Renton Bridges. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule on the so-called Bridges resolution. This is frankly an unusual piece of legislation; but, equally frankly, it is to meet an unusual condition. And I wish at the outset to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] for his industry and patriotism in sponsoring this legislation.

Harry Bridges has been a guest of the United States for approximately 20 years. He is an alien, a resident of Australia, and is within the borders of the United States as a guest of this country. As such he, of course, is amenable to the laws of the country and certainly should comport himself as a guest and comport himself with the laws that govern our own American citizens. I do not have time to go into all of the details of the history of the sojourn of Mr. Bridges in this country. Suffice it to say that he has been a troublemaker. He has not comported himself in the manner that has met with the approval of American citizens generally. He has been a disturbing factor and ought to be deported from this country.

We are now in the process of expending billions of dollars of the people's money to prepare this country to meet any eventuality. The first thing we ought to do in this country is to get our own house in order and to see that we do not have within our own borders those who are guilty of or who likely would be guilty in time of a national crisis of sabotage and subversive activities. We do not want to have to wait in this country until we are spilling the lifeblood of our own nationals in defense of the country in order to rid ourselves of unwelcome guests.

I think this man ought to have been deported a long time ago. Although the conclusion of the Landis report was that he should not be deported, I say that in that report he is indicted as an unwelcome visitor to this country.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am sorry, my time is rather limited.

I say that the Landis report shows that while he is not an admitted Communist, he has associated intimately with and has been in conference with and has gone along with the leadership of the communistic element within the borders of

this country. This being true, he having alined himself with this communistic element within the country, he has not comport himself with proper respect for the institutions of our country and its Government.

CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION

There can be no doubt that the power of Congress to regulate and control the admission, rejection, and deportation of aliens is an absolute one (*Hawe May v. North*, 183 F. 89 (C. C. A. 9th, 1910), cert. den., 223 U. S. 717 (1911)).

This is true even though an alien is entitled to the protection of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and fourteenth amendments (*Skeffington v. Katzeff*, 277 F. 129 (C. C. A. 1, 1923)). The rights of an alien to these protections does not deprive the Congress of its power to order the deportation of an alien whose presence in the country is deemed hurtful (*Ng Hung Fo v. White*, 259 U. S. 276 (1922)).

It must be remembered that there is no constitutional limit to the power of Congress to exclude or expel aliens—see *Skeffington* against *Katzeff*, supra. As a matter of fact, Congress may exercise this power, even in times of peace, for any reason it may deem sufficient (*Chay Chan Ping v. United States*, 130 U. S. 581 (1889)). In addition to this power that may be exercised at any time, it has been held that an alien acquires no rights by a domicile in this country that will relieve him of the effect of a decision ordering deportation by an agent of Congress, the Department of Labor (*Ex parte Crawford*, 165 F. 830 (D. C. N. Y. 1908)).

From the above it can be seen that the power of Congress with regard to the control of aliens is practically absolute. The question then is whether or not the exercise of this power violates article I, section 9, of the Constitution, which reads:

No bill of attainder or exposed facto law shall be passed.

A bill of attainder has been defined as a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. However, if the punishment is less than death, the act is termed a bill of pains and penalties. In its interpretation of this provision, though, the Supreme Court has held that the bill of attainder includes the bill of pains and penalties. *Cummings v. State of Missouri* (4 Wall. 277, 323 (1867)). In that case the Supreme Court held unconstitutional a provision of the Missouri constitution that required a so-called expurgatory oath for any person in the position of trust or responsibility. The oath was the result of the high feeling engendered during the War between the States. In holding the provision unconstitutional the Supreme Court, through Mr. Justice Field, said:

It [the constitution] intended that the rights of the citizen should be secure against deprivation for past conduct by legislative enactment, under any form, however disguised. * * * *Cummings v. Missouri* (supra, at 325).

From the quotation thus given it can be seen that the concern of the Supreme Court was directed toward the invasion of rights of citizens, not of persons who had not attained the status of citizenship. This construction is borne out by the constitutional debates where the founding fathers were concerned principally with the bills of attainder that had originated in England and had been applied for the purpose of banishing various persons that had become undesirable. This bill was used in England for the last time in the case of Sir John Fenwick. See Hutchinson, the Foundation of the Constitution 138, 157. Bills of attainder were not unknown in the colonies, as they had been used on several occasions to secure the banishment of undesirable persons. Several colonial constitutions prohibited these bills prior to the adoption of the provision in the Constitution above referred to.

It appears clear that these bills had been aimed at persons who were citizens, as otherwise they would have been unnecessary, due to the control that is inherent in a sovereign State over its alien population. Thus the purpose of the framers of the Constitution must have been to protect the rights of citizens from being invaded by the legislature through the enactment of bills of attainder.

The absolute control of Congress of the exclusion and ejection of aliens, plus the fact that the constitutional provision prohibiting bills of attainder could only have been aimed at the protection of citizens, make it clear that an alien may be ordered to be deported by the Congress without infringing the constitutional prohibition against bills of attainder.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NICHOLS). The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLMER. We are going to hear a lot during the debate on the rule and the bill it makes in order about hysteria, about civil rights, civil liberties, and so forth. But let me point out to you that this man is an undesirable alien, that for 20 years he has stirred up trouble in this country. One of the first things we ought to do at this time is to get our own house in order. We should be controlled neither by hysteria nor false sentiment. False sentiment should not lead us to try to protect aliens in this country who work against the interests of the country. If this man were an American citizen rather than a guest of the country and we had the laws to deport him, he ought to be deported. If that unfortunate time should come that we get into a great international crisis, this man, even though he were a citizen of the United States, would be interned.

I think the rule ought to be adopted. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to remove Madam Perkins' Bridges. [Applause.] You will probably hear a great deal during the discussion of this rule and the bill that follows as to the constitutional powers of the House of Representatives to act. This is not exactly a new matter with me. Ten years ago when I was chairman of the Committee to Investigate Communist Activities and Propaganda in the United States the committee unanimously urged the deportation of alien agitators. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress has the power to deport any alien agitators. I do not care whether they come from the left or the right; whether they are Communists, Nazis, or just alien agitators. Even if we did not like the color of their eyes or the color of their hair, the Congress has full power under the law and the Constitution to deport them; and we have the power today to deport Harry Bridges as an undesirable alien. You do not have to prove that he is a Communist; you do not have to prove anything else except that he is an alien agitator and an undesirable alien. And I go even further: You do not even have to prove that he is an undesirable alien if the Congress thinks it is in the interest of America and our institutions to deport such a person as Harry Bridges. We not only have the right to do so, but it is our duty to do so.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. For a question.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does not the gentleman believe that a person should be deported pursuant to the statutes the Congress has enacted? And if Congress feels that those statutes are inadequate, should we not have proper remedial general legislation rather than to have the entire Congress of the United States set itself up against one man?

Mr. FISH. We are not setting ourselves up against one man.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is what you are doing.

Mr. FISH. This man is a symbol; he is a symbol of un-American activities and the "fifth columnists" in our midst. My only regret is that we have delayed so long. We should have enacted this bill 5 years ago. [Applause.] The trouble with Congress is that we tolerate these un-American activities too long. No other nation in the world would tolerate the insidious activities of an alien agitator like Harry Bridges in its midst. The time has come to find out whether Harry

Bridges, an Australian alien, or the Congress of the United States runs this Government. [Applause.]

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania. Is not the Constitution designed to defend its citizens and not its enemies?

Mr. FISH. Certainly. And we have more to fear from our enemies from within than from our enemies from without. [Applause.] We have spent a lot of our time talking about our enemies from without, but it is time to clean our house from our enemies from within.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. With reference to the statement made by the gentleman from New York about the general immigration law, is it not a fact that although we have a general immigration law covering importation of aliens, we do import many aliens under special acts of Congress? This Congress has imported many aliens under special acts for which the gentleman from New York voted. Only last week the gentleman voted for such alien-import bills on the Private Calendar. If we can import aliens by special acts of Congress, we can export them by special acts.

Mr. FISH. There is no question about the power of Congress to do this. Article I, section 1 states:

Congress shall have the power to establish uniform rules of naturalization.

We have this power and we also have the power to regulate deportations. Many years ago I went as far as to say, and I believe it today more than ever before, that we do not even have to say that an alien is a Communist, we do not even have to say he is a "fifth columnist," we do not even have to say he is an undesirable alien or an agitator; all we have to say is we do not want him in this country. We may even say we do not like the color of his hair. I hope the Congress will use its constitutional and legislative power and send this alien agitator, Harry Bridges, back to Australia where he belongs. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not take the floor at this time to defend Bridges, nor do I take the floor to argue or persuade you to vote down the rule. I take the floor in defense of democracy and in defense of our constitutional form of government. I will give a man a chance to speak freely and I will defend that man under our Constitution. I loathe Communists as much as any Member of this House. They have no business here, and we should provide proper procedure to solve the problem by statute in order to dispose of our enemies from within. This is a problem I have talked about in this Congress for 6 long years. My appearance on this floor today is solely to bring out the fact that I do not question the right of the committee to vote out this bill, nor do I infer any bad motives. I have the highest regard for every member of my committee, and I respect their opinions. They saw the thing one way, and I may have seen the matter in another way.

The only fact I want to bring to your attention at this time is, regardless of whether it be Bridges or anyone else, he ought to have his day in court. Although I might have agreed with the committee that Bridges is an undesirable alien and should be deported, it is my contention and I still believe that Bridges should have received a hearing at the hands of the committee so that he could present, as I understand he wanted to do, his side of the case. It seems to me that this sort of procedure is wrong. I have pleaded with the members of my committee, whose opinions I regard highly, to give the man a hearing, but this was voted down. I am not here defending Communists, and I want that clearly understood. I do not want any Member to come back and say that I am right on the job in the defense of communism. My record speaks for itself. I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, about our constitutional form of government, which provides

that a man has a right to his day in court, which Bridges did not receive, and that is the point I am making before this House today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is it not true that this man Bridges has four times applied for citizenship, then when the storm was over he has withdrawn his application?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not know Bridges, and I do not want to know him. But the fact remains that in the Stryker case, which is a parallel with the Bridges case, the Supreme Court exonerated Stryker. The Landis opinion exonerated Bridges. I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] that we have the right, that the committee and the Congress have the right; but do you want to exercise that right and go that far? It would permit any Member to introduce a private bill to deport anyone in this country for some reason or other, and I do not think that this should be done without a hearing before a committee so that evidence may be presented to sustain the facts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Did not the gentleman introduce some bills to import them?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not yield. I told you a moment ago—and I want the gentleman who injected that question to listen—that I have not introduced bills to import them. I have not introduced any bill to import anybody, and I do not question the right of the committee or the Congress to pass this bill. I am only appealing to your sense of justice that a man ought to have his day in court and he should be given a hearing. That is all I am presenting to you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS], a member of the Dies committee.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, back in March 1939 I introduced a resolution to impeach the Secretary of Labor and two of her assistants for their failure—I called it conspiracy—to take the necessary action which would result in the deportation of Harry Bridges. My resolution was referred to the Judiciary Committee, which carried on extensive hearings and made an investigation. The result was there was no impeachment. But a lot of water has gone over the dam since then. If there was reason then, as I was certain there was, to deport Harry Bridges, there is more reason today for doing so. All you have to do is to read the testimony given in the hearings before the Dies committee to come to a definite conclusion that Harry Bridges should be deported from the United States. I now want to read some of it to you—a paragraph from the published hearings held by the Dies committee. This is from volume No. 4. This is testimony given to the committee by Capt. John J. Keegan, chief of detectives of the Portland, Oreg., police department, a man who has made a study of not only the Bridges case but Communist activity on the Pacific coast, and this is what Captain Keegan said to the committee:

We found that Harry Bridges, leader of the Longshoremens' Union on the Pacific coast, was an alien and a member of the Communist Party of the United States of America, and also that Harold Pritchett was a Canadian subject and also a member of the Communist Party. He is president of the Timbermens' and Saw Mill Workers' Union International; and that these two men have been active in and around the Portland area as well as in other areas on the Pacific coast; and that while they are working under the guise of labor leaders, they are in reality both members of the Communist Party; and that, based upon his investigation and the affidavits which he is in a position to furnish to the committee, he would say that their real purpose, in my belief, is to undermine the Government and overthrow it by force and violence when the proper time comes.

Since we got that particular testimony, the Dies committee has received any amount of additional testimony which conclusively shows that Harry Bridges is a Communist and a menace to our form of government and to the people of this country. This man Bridges is not only a menace to our institutions and to our Government but he is also a menace to the very people he says he represents—labor. He is more of

a menace to labor in the United States than is any one other person in the country. He is doing an irreparable harm to labor. I think that labor should be more interested in having this man deported than any other group in this country.

May I say in conclusion that the people of this Nation are sick unto death with the way we have pussyfooted on this question of "fifth columnists." They are disgusted at the way the Department of Labor has coddled this man Bridges. They know he has been the blond-haired boy of the Department of Labor for the last number of years. They now want action. They are certain that the only place they can get action is in this body, the House of Representatives, so I think that today we must take favorable action not only on the rule but also on the bill in order to forthwith deport Harry Bridges, and make him an example to the entire country. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States contains the following statement: "No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed." The annotated Constitution, as published by the Government Printing Office, defines a bill of attainder as a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial.

In this case the House committee in charge of the bill now before us refused to give the person to be punished even a hearing, and ignored the fact that in a previous trial under due process he was acquitted from all the charges made against him and a warrant of deportation against him was dismissed.

The bill is clearly a bill of attainder within the meaning of the Constitution. Its passage would be a violation of the limitation of power imposed by the Constitution upon Congress, a violation made flagrant by the fact that the committee which reported the bill refused, by a vote of 9 to 3, to give Bridges or his counsel any hearing at all. The committee report frankly states that it deliberately recommends the deportation of Bridges without giving any reason therefor.

Last year the Department of Labor issued a warrant for the arrest of Harry R. Bridges, an alien, on the ground that he was subject to deportation under the provisions of section 2 of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by the act of June 5, 1920 (8 U. S. C. sec. 137). The specific charges made in the warrant against Bridges were as follows:

First. That, after he entered the United States, he became a member of an organization that advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

Second. That, after he entered the United States, he became affiliated with such an organization.

Third. That, after he entered the United States, he became a member of an organization that causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, and displayed printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

Fourth. That, after he entered the United States, he became affiliated with such an organization.

Thereafter, in the congressional district which I represent, hearings were conducted for a period of 11 weeks to enable Bridges to show cause why he should not be deported. Rarely has any defendant in a criminal action in this country been subjected to a more searching and extensive trial.

The trial examiner appointed by the Secretary of Labor to conduct this hearing was James N. Landis, dean of the Harvard Law School.

The testimony covers 7,724 pages, exclusive of 274 exhibits. As indicative of the time consumed respectively by the parties, a rough count would attribute 2,900 of these pages to interrogation of witnesses by the Government, 3,600 to interrogation of witnesses by counsel for the alien, 500 to interrogation of witnesses by the examiner and the balance to proceedings

of a miscellaneous nature. Of the 274 exhibits, 138 were introduced by the Government and 136 by the alien.

Contrary to the usual procedure in such cases, the hearings were open to the public.

On December 28 last, the trial examiner, Dean Landis, reported to the Secretary of Labor that—

My conclusions are that the evidence does not permit the finding that Harry R. Bridges is either a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with that party.

In his report, the trial examiner, Dean Landis, made a very lengthy analysis of the testimony of all of the important witnesses who testified during the hearings, and set forth carefully the features of their testimony which led him to his conclusions.

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization has completely ignored the trial and acquittal of Bridges. The bill now under consideration would authorize his deportation by an arbitrary act of Congress, without giving any reason therefor. This is stated plainly in the committee report on this bill.

In other words, although Harry Bridges has been arrested, kept in jeopardy of deportation for a period of 11 weeks during one of the most searching and exhaustive trials in the history of American immigration law, and finally exonerated and acquitted by the findings of one of the most eminent legal scholars in America who acted as the trial examiner, it is now proposed by this legislation to disregard all of these facts and deport him forthwith without regard to right or justice.

My opposition to this bill is not in any sense a plea for the leniency to the individual, Harry Bridges. My acquaintance with him is very slight.

But I am deeply concerned with the violence which such an action would do to certain fundamental American principles which I hold dearer than anything else in life. The intense inquisition to which this man was subjected during his lengthy trial last year did not reveal a single ground upon which a criminal action could be brought against him. But he has been the leader of a powerful and militant branch of organized labor and has led the membership of his organization through several bitter strikes. I say to you without hesitation that the enmities aroused by his militant leadership in these industrial conflicts are primarily responsible for the determined campaign to deport him from this country. Whether the Members of Congress realize it at the time or not, if Harry Bridges is deported by this action it will be because he has been a militant leader of labor. Congress could, and should, logically proceed, therefore, to punish by special legislation all labor leaders who have conducted strikes in which violence has occurred.

I am an advocate of complete preparedness for national defense, and as a Member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House I have given my wholehearted support to the program of expansion of national armament which is now under consideration. If I believed for one moment that the continued presence of Harry Bridges in this country constituted a menace to the safety of the Nation because of a danger that he might become a leader in a "fifth-column" activity, I would undoubtedly give my support to legislation designed to remove such a menace. But there is no justification for such a belief except the suspicions and unsupported accusations directed against him by those who hate his labor record.

I am under no illusions as to the unpopularity in certain circles of the position which it is my duty to assume here today. The gentleman from Louisiana, who is the author of this bill, said he could not conceive how any American could oppose it. I say to you that it is because I am an American—because the America I love, and which my forefathers helped to create, is the America of tolerance, of freedom from oppression, of refuge for political exiles, of civil liberties for all—and because I fear that these sacred institutions of freedom which constitute the very heart of the America which I love are endangered by the exercise of ruthless power such as is here contemplated—because of all these things I am constrained to ignore the criticism which

I know is in store for me, and to appear here in opposition to this rule.

One hundred and forty-two years ago the Federalists, representative privileged and money classes, were responsible for the adoption of drastic Alien and Sedition Acts. President Thomas Jefferson later drafted resolutions declaring the alien and sedition acts null and void and in violation of the Constitution.

Congress, in considering this measure, should remember the inscription on the Statue of Liberty:

Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to be free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore; send these, the homeless, the tempest-tost to me; I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

Does Congress wish this inscription on the Statue of Liberty to be erased? [Applause.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself one-half minute, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, Premier Reynaud's message to President Roosevelt, made well before his speech at Charlottesville, said, "Italy has struck her neighbor in the back with a dagger."

President Roosevelt in his speech Monday night said, "Italy has driven a dagger into the back of her neighbor."

I hope that the time has not come in America when our President's state papers are dictated and copied from foreign capitals. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California, who preceded me, was clearly in error as to whether or not the Congress can deport Harry Bridges. Two questions present themselves to the Congress. The first one is, can we deport Harry Bridges? The second one is, should we deport Harry Bridges? Those who say we cannot do it rely upon constitutional provisions which interdict a bill of attainder or an ex post facto law. Let us look for a moment at what Mr. Justice Field said in the case of *Cummings v. State of Missouri* (4 Wall. 277):

A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without prejudicial trial.

If the punishment be less than death, the act is termed a bill of pains and penalties.

Within the meaning of the Constitution, bills of attainder include bills of pains and penalties.

Remember that word "punishment" because that is vital.

By an ex post facto law is meant one which imposes a punishment for an act which was not punishable at the time it was committed, or imposes additional punishment to that then prescribed, or changes the rule of evidence by which less or different testimony is sufficient to convict than was required.

Let us see whether or not under that definition the bill before us constitutes a bill of attainder or an ex post facto law. I quote from the case of *Wong Wing v. United States* (163 U. S. 229, at p. 236), the opinion of Mr. Justice Shiras, May 18, 1896:

The order of deportation is not a punishment for crime.

It is not a punishment; that is where the gentleman from California fell into error.

It is not a banishment in the sense in which that word is often applied to the expulsion of a citizen from his country by way of punishment.

It is but a method of enforcing the return to his own country of an alien who has not complied with the conditions upon the performance of which the Government of the Nation, acting within its constitutional authority and through the proper departments, has determined that his continuing to reside here shall depend.

So it is not a punishment for a crime. Get that in mind. Congress is clearly within its authority. This is not an ex post facto law or a bill of attainder.

Mr. MARCANTONIO and Mr. GAVAGAN rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no time; I am sorry.

LXXXVI—515

Now, let me quote just a little further upon the advisability and the wisdom and the authority of the judicial branch to impose any restriction upon the Congress in this matter, quoting now from the case of *Li Sing v. United States* (180 U. S., p. 486), the opinion of Mr. Justice Shiras:

The question whether and upon what conditions these aliens shall be permitted to remain within the United States being one to be determined by the political departments of the Government, the judicial department cannot properly express an opinion upon the wisdom, the policy, or the justice of the measures enacted by Congress in the exercise of the powers confided to it by the Constitution over this subject.

What more is necessary in answering question No. 1 as to whether the Congress can deport Harry Bridges? The Congress can do so, and it is neither ex post facto nor a bill of attainder.

The second question is, Shall we deport Harry Bridges? I think the answer to that can be found in the special report which was filed by Dean Landis on special appointment as trial examiner in the Harry Bridges case, and all you need to do is to read his conclusions regarding the activities of Harry Bridges. Here is what Dean Landis says:

Bridges' relationships to the Communist Party have already been sketched at length. They are, in general, his well-defined opposition toward "red" baiting; his acceptance of aid and assistance in his industrial struggles from the Communist Party—indeed, his solicitation of that aid; his expressed disinclination to disavow that help; his association with persons admittedly Communists, an association that derives primarily from his requests for and acceptance of such aid. There are, specifically, his support of the Western Worker during the 1934 maritime strike; his requests for aid in connection with such issues as the King-Ramsay-Connor and Modesto cases and the United Labor Party ticket; his not infrequent conferences with the Communist officials on the Pacific coast in regard to these and other matters; his admiration of the sincerity of persons in the trade-union movement, some of whom were avowedly Communists; and his willingness to work with them in the realization of his trade-union ideas.

This evidence, however much it may disclose lack of judgment or associations that may be regarded by others as reprehensible or unfortunate, falls short of the statutory definition of affiliation. Persons engaged in bitter industrial struggles tend to seek help and assistance from every available source. But the intermittent solicitation and acceptance of such help must be shown to have ripened into those bonds of mutual cooperation and alliance that entail continuing reciprocal duties and responsibilities before they can be deemed to come within the statutory requirement of affiliation. Judge Chase, in *Kettunen v. Reimer* (79 F. (2d) 315), and the other judges in the cases heretofore reviewed, insist upon the application of this standard. To expand that statutory definition to embrace within its terms ad hoc cooperation on objectives whose pursuit is clearly allowable under our constitutional system, or friendly associations that have not been shown to have resulted in the employment of illegal means, is warranted neither by reason nor by law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the language of Dean Landis himself, who rendered a 150-page opinion in this case, indicates to all the world the answer to the second question, the undesirability of keeping Harry Bridges in the United States.

The authorities are clearly all on one side that we can deport him, and I think the evidence is all on one side that he should be deported. As I make this statement I want to pay my gracious testimony to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. LOUIS GRAHAM, on the Republican side, former United States District Attorney at Pittsburgh, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States, who has handled many deportation cases and who has dug out much of the law. I am willing to go along with that gentleman because he is an expert from long practice and from an experience of 38 years at the bar. When he says to me we can do it and that he has done it, as a practical matter, that resolves question No. 1 whether we can deport Harry Bridges.

On question No. 2, take the record of Dean Landis and it is an answer as to whether he should be deported.

Let me add that the bill before us ought to be modified in language so as to make it absolutely mandatory, so that there is no power in or out of government to stop these deportation proceedings. [Applause.]

Now to summarize the situation before us, the decisions are quite clear and unequivocal that the element of punishment must be present to make a legislative act fall within the prohibition of the Constitution on bills of attainder and ex post facto enactments. Deportation in the language of the court is not a punishment. Therefore, the measure before us is neither a bill of attainder or an ex post facto act. Congress can therefore deport Harry Bridges.

As to the question of whether Congress should issue a legislative mandate to deport him, the record is abundantly clear on that point. His undesirability has been fairly well established.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I fully appreciate, especially at this time, that it will be very unpopular to say anything in the defense of Harry Bridges, or in opposition to the deportation bill pending before us, but notwithstanding that fact, I feel it my solemn duty to call attention to the House and the country that such legislation is in violation of the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights.

I feel there is not a lawyer of experience who is a Member of the House who will have the temerity to claim that the bill will be held constitutional. But notwithstanding this, they may and probably will support the bill, because it will subject them to the lesser amount of criticism. I predict there will be very few who will have the courage to vote according to their innermost convictions.

However, Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a time to give real serious consideration to a measure before deviating in any way from our constitutional restrictions and privileges, this is the time. But, unfortunately, due to the well-organized and Nation-wide attacks upon this labor leader, and I deplore and regret the fact he is not an American citizen, I fear the country believes him to be a dangerous person who should not be permitted to remain in the United States. One can hardly blame the people for being of this opinion in the face of a persistent and systematic campaign to have him publicized as an extreme and dangerous Communist. Unfortunately, those who ordinarily believe in fair and square dealing and just treatment never were able to obtain his side of the case.

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization reported the bill without giving him or his attorney a minute's time, and even when the bill was before the Rules Committee no one was given a chance to show that many of these charges and accusations were not founded on facts. Personally, I have received hundreds of telegrams and letters from nearly all the labor organizations, urging that opportunity be granted Mr. Bridges to defend himself, but it was of no avail. The resolution, same as the bill, was forced through without granting his appeals and requests. Only a few days ago I received a personal letter from Mr. Bridges, and I presume a similar letter was mailed to others, and I feel that you Members who are going to vote for the rule and his deportation may some day, after you have acted and have had time to peruse this letter, realize that Mr. Bridges clearly and positively denies all the accusations, and, for that reason, I am going to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks and to include therein a letter from Harry Bridges. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, since obtaining the unanimous consent to insert Mr. Bridges' letter in the RECORD, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has obtained unanimous consent to read the letter, and, therefore, to save space and prevent repetition, I shall not avail myself of the unanimous consent, because that letter will appear in Mr. MARCANTONIO's remarks.

In lieu of his letter, I will quote extracts from an editorial by Chester Rowell, one of the most prominent editors on the

Pacific coast, which appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle May 24, 1940, and which is entitled to our thought and consideration:

Congress is still playing with the idea of deporting Harry Bridges by bill of attainder, regardless of the constitutional prohibition of such a process. It is a curious paradox that those who shout most loudly for the Constitution are often those least familiar with its provisions and least concerned for granting to others the rights it guarantees to themselves. In this case, since the effort to deport Bridges by due process of law failed on a finding of want of proof, it is proposed to substitute undue process of attainder. For surely, these objectors conclude, Bridges is an "undesirable alien," since they do not desire him. And if it is pointed out that there is no general law for the deportation of aliens merely because they are "undesirable," what could be simpler than a special law for the deportation of this particular undesired one?

The general right of an alien who legally entered the country to remain here unless found guilty of deportable offense cannot be taken away by a special legislative act declaring him guilty of that offense without hearing and imposing on him a penalty not thereby applied to others. This is the exact "bill of attainder" which the Constitution forbids. It had been a real evil, under despotic governments in England. It has since passed so far out of use and memory that most people had forgotten even the constitutional provision against it. This Bridges resolution is the first time it has been proposed in American history.

In these times, when feeling runs high and when the "fifth column," which has proved so dangerous elsewhere, may have to be dealt with here, it is especially important that we realize the importance of proceeding against only actual evils, and not even against them by denying rights whose protection is important to all of us. There was too much of that, under less provocation, in the last war. The temptation may be greater now, which is the greater reason for being on our guard against it.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to repeat what I have said on the floor a dozen times, that I am just as much opposed to communism as nazi-ism, and you know my position on nazi-ism and fascism. But this man, whom we are about to order deported, positively states that he is not a Communist, and that he believes in a democratic form of government. The fact that his son has served and has reenlisted in the Army of the United States, and in view of the further fact that he, himself, by telegraph, nearly 2 years ago called attention of the President and the Department of Justice to some of the subversive activities of the real culprits, namely, certain members of the German Bund and the Nazi organizations, should satisfy anyone that he cannot be a Communist.

He admits that he has received aid from many organizations, religious and political leaders, including even Communists, in his effort to organize the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, which he accomplished and which is one of the strongest and most democratic and representative labor organizations in the United States today. Not only does he make clear that although every effort has been made to bribe him, he remained steadfast in his duties toward his coworkers, which brought about higher wages and shorter hours. I view this fight as one angle of the eternal effort of great and powerful employers to discredit organized labor—as only that and nothing more.

Some day, in the near future, the country will know what organization or what men are really guilty of subversive activities specialized in by agents of the "fifth column." In fact, in the last few days it has been made clear that it is the Nazis and the Fascists in our country who are the dangerous elements within our midst, but, as I stated sometime ago, in their shrewd and clever manner, they continue to insinuate and accuse every progressive labor leader of being communistic so as to divert attention from their own subversive activities.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that among others that will speak for the resolution will be the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER], and I predict he will continue to assail Mr. Bridges as a Communist and as a danger to America. I am commencing to strongly feel that this may be for the purpose of distracting attention from the activities of the "fifth columnists," namely, the Nazis.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked with several of the Members of Congress from the State of California, who know Mr. Bridges and of his activities, and with the exception of two Members, they all feel that the shipping interests are be-

hind the movement to bring about this action which we are about to take.

The specific charges made in the warrant against Bridges were four in number:

(1) That, after he entered the United States, he became a member of an organization that advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

(2) That, after he entered the United States, he became affiliated with such an organization.

(3) That, after he entered the United States, he became a member of an organization that causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, and displayed printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

(4) That, after he entered the United States, he became affiliated with such an organization.

Bridges went through 9 weeks of investigation and trial, and throughout he was courteous, respectful, and helpful to the court and investigators, frankly answering all questions, showing no resentment nor evasiveness at any time. The trial examiner was James M. Landis, dean of the Harvard Law School, especially selected by the Labor Department because of his recognized ability and standing with the American bar. His finding, covering 152 printed pages, was a complete exoneration of Bridges, and was as follows:

Conclusion: The evidence therefore establishes neither that Harry R. Bridges is a member of nor affiliated with the Communist Party of the United States of America.

Out of the hundreds of telegrams and letters that I have received protesting the passage of this bill I will tax the Record with but a few:

We vigorously urge the House Rules Committee to reject and bury H. R. 9766. The matter of the deportation of Harry Bridges has been acted upon by the recognized judicial bodies of this country and his innocence has been duly established. For your committee now to recommend any action contrary to the decision handed down by those judicial bodies would, in our opinion, be a miscarriage of justice and a violation of basic democratic principles.

SAN FRANCISCO-OAKLAND
NEWSPAPER GUILD,
CHARLES L. IRVINE,
Executive Secretary.

Five hundred marine radio officers, members American Communications Association, protest against and urge defeat of H. R. 9766, intended to deport Harry Bridges, C. I. O. director in California, as nullifying the Bill of Rights and denial of civil liberties.

AMERICAN COMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION,
Local 2, New York City.

International Woodworkers of America, representing 100,000 organized woodworkers in 23 States, unqualifiedly denounce H. R. 9766 as being not only discriminatory and designed to crush organized labor but as unconstitutional and opposed to the democratic rights on which our governmental structure is based.

B. J. McCARTY,
Secretary-Treasurer, Seattle, Wash.

Some of the speeches here today are suggestive of that state of hysteria that was prevalent in this Chamber in the days preceding the vote that put us in the World War. Calm judgment becomes almost impossible where hysteria exists.

Some of the speakers painted Bridges as the foremost law-breaker of the country. If he has broken even one of our laws, why has he not been arrested, convicted, and put in jail?

Most of the speakers say that he was an agitator, and that he made people discontented. Every single step of progress that the human race has achieved since the curtain rose on the dawn of civilization was the result of agitation. If there had not been agitation by Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, and a lot of others, we would not be under the American flag today, but still under the flag of Great Britain. If we ourselves had not done a little agitating among our home folks, all of us would still be down on the farm, or to say the least, we would not be here.

If there had not been 50 years of agitation, women today would not have the vote. Before the Constitution was amended to make woman suffrage constitutional, it was held that women were not "people" within the meaning of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the

United States and therefore were not eligible to vote. But the women started agitating, resorting to such tactics as chaining themselves to lamp posts, and in other ways making themselves so disagreeable that their agitation finally brought results.

If there had never been any agitating, there would never have been any labor unions, and if there had never been any labor unions, workers would still be working 12 and 14 hours per day at pitifully small wages as they were in the steel mills before organized labor succeeded through agitation in making the workers so discontented they went on strikes until thereby they finally succeeded in improving their conditions and standards of living. Agitation has been responsible for every bit of progressive legislation that has ever passed this House of Representatives in which we today have been so vehemently decrying and denouncing agitation. When agitation ceases, all reforms and improvements will cease, and we will become a decadent people and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, though I know the bill under consideration will pass by a tremendous majority, I, myself, personally, conscious of my oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights, cannot bring myself to the point of being willing to take the responsibility of voting for this bill which I believe is unjust, definitely unconstitutional, and a violation of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER].

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has properly presented the case in behalf of this bill to deport Harry Bridges. I am glad that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], chairman of the Immigration Committee of the House, has admitted that by special act of Congress we can legally export individual aliens, because day after day his committee favorably reports special act bills to import individual aliens. I respectfully submit these facts to my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], who has voted for many special act bills to import individual aliens.

I hold in my hand—and this is not hearsay—a 72-page document entitled "Why Communism?" by M. J. Olgin. I shall quote briefly from this Communist document, which is published by the Workers Library Publishers, of New York City, which is the official Communist publishing house in the United States. At the bottom of the last page, page 72, appears a symbol which is not the symbol of the United States, but the hammer and sickle, symbol of the Communist bloody red butchers of Moscow. Beneath this symbol appear the words, "Emblem of the Communist Party."

I now quote from page 72 of this Communist publication, as follows:

The seat of the Comintern is Moscow because this is the capital of the only workers' and peasants' government in the world, and the Comintern can meet there freely. As the workers become the rulers of other countries the Comintern will not have to confine its meetings to Moscow alone.

The Communist Party of the United States of America is thus part of a world-wide organization which gives it guidance and enhances its fighting power. Under the leadership of the Communist Party the workers of the United States of America will proceed from struggle to struggle, from victory to victory, until, rising in a revolution, they will crush the capitalist state, establish a Soviet state, abolish the cruel and bloody system of capitalism and proceed to the upbuilding of socialism.

This is why every worker must join the Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker, from page 32 of this Communist bible I quote the following:

We Communists say that there is one way to abolish the capitalist state, and that is to smash it by force. To make communism possible the workers must take hold of the state machinery of capitalism and destroy it.

Mr. Speaker, chapter 6 of this Communist booklet is entitled "The Revolutionary Overthrow of Capitalism and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," and I now read from page 59, as follows:

It is not necessary that this final blow, i. e., the revolution, should come in connection with an imperialist war, although this is very likely. Capitalism will seek to prevent a revolution by

plunging the country into war. War is to serve not only as a way out of the crisis but as a means to arouse the patriotism of the masses, to increase governmental terror (martial law), and to divert public attention from internal affairs. War, under such conditions, for a while retarding the revolutionary movement, may hasten it later when the war sufferings begin to tell on the masses.

A time comes when there is demoralization above, a growing revolt below; the morale of the army is also undermined. The old structure of society is tottering. There are actual insurrections; the army wavers. Panic seizes the rulers. A general uprising begins.

Workers stop work, many of them seize arms by attacking arsenals. Many had armed themselves before as the struggles sharpened. Street fights become frequent. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the workers organize revolutionary committees to be in command of the uprising. There are battles in the principal cities. Barricades are built and defended. The workers' fighting has a decisive influence with the soldiers. Army units begin to join the revolutionary fighters; there is fraternization between the workers and the soldiers, the workers and the marines. The movement among the soldiers and marines spreads. Capitalism is losing its strongest weapon, the army. The police as a rule continue fighting, but they are soon silenced and made to flee by the united revolutionary forces of workers and soldiers. The revolution is victorious.

Mr. Speaker, under a heading entitled "The Question of Force and Violence," which appears on page 61, we find:

But this is force and violence, somebody will contend. Don't you Communists know that the use of force and violence is wrong? We reply to this, first, that if being a red-blooded American means anything, it means that you must not take punishment lying down, that you must offer resistance; secondly, that it is not the workers but the capitalists and their state that start the use of force and violence.

Mr. Speaker, we also find in chapter 6 of this Communist publication under the heading "The Soviet state" the following language, which appears on page 63:

This Government has the great task of taking away from the owners the plants, factories, railroads, banks, and turning them into public property to be administered by the workers for the common benefit of all. In other words, it is the task of the Soviets to abolish private property in the means of production and to establish socialist production and distribution.

This cannot be accomplished peacefully. The exploiters won't give up their loot, even after their state power is crushed. They will have to be routed. The Soviet Government will have to expropriate the expropriators by force. The latter will conspire and plot against the new system; they will organize counterrevolutionary uprisings. The Soviet state will have to crush these with an iron hand. The former exploiters will be given no quarter. The old system of robbery with all its rubbish will have to be cleared away. This means that the Soviet state must be ruthless; it must destroy the counterrevolutionary forces—the quicker the better for the workers and for the future of mankind. This is why the Soviet State is named Dictatorship of the Proletariat. It is the reverse of capitalist dictatorship. It does not pretend to be a government treating all on the basis of equality. It openly declares itself to be a class government, directed against the former ruling class. It is avowedly an instrument for the expropriation and suppression of the former exploiters and oppressors. It is a government of the former exploited and oppressed. And it does away with exploitation and oppression forever. As soon as private property is abolished, as soon as the industrial machinery of the country has become socialized; as soon as the individual farmers have been induced, for their own advantage, to unite in collective farms, exploitation of man by man ceases to exist. That means freedom.

Mr. Speaker, the alien British subject Harry Bridges was the ringleader of the indefensible San Francisco general strike. Let us examine the record of this Communist manifesto and observe that this strike was a part of the Communist United Front program.

From page 56 of this Communist booklet I now read the following:

It is for this reason that we Communists have been advocating and organizing the United Front for the last few years. While we have met with resistance on the part of many reformist union leaders and leaders of the Socialist Party, we have met with response among the workers and farmers. Thus, united May Day demonstrations, united anti-Facist and antiwar demonstrations, united fights for home relief, united campaigns for social insurance, and, above all other things, the great San Francisco general strike have been brought about.

Mr. Speaker, that is the destructive general strike which was led by Harry Bridges, the alien British subject. He is a Communist agent and an able leader of the "fifth column," linked with the bloody "red" Communist butchers in Moscow by their own publication which I hold in my hand and from

which I have quoted. Alien Harry Bridges has been carrying on a guerilla warfare in order to paralyze and obtain control of our American merchant marine, which is an essential arm of our national defense, just as essential as airplanes, cruisers, submarines, and battleships.

Mr. Speaker, are we going to permit an alien Communist controlled and directed foreign agent like Harry Bridges to hamstring and control our American merchant marine which is an essential arm of our national defense? With all of the potential dangers confronting our country are we going to permit an alien agent of Communist Russia or any other foreign country to control any part of our national defense, whether it be the battle fleet, a squadron of airplanes, or our merchant marine? I do not intend to do so, and will therefore vote for this pending bill to deport alien Harry Bridges, a big-shot leader of the Communist United Front.

Mr. Speaker, the record of Bridges is such as would justify a unanimous vote to deport this alien Communist agent who has been doing everything he can to advance the Communist program to destroy the Government of the United States from within and replace it with a Soviet Communist system as outlined in the Communist publication from which I have quoted verbatim. Let no one who votes against this Bridges deportation bill ever claim to be opposed to alien "fifth columns" whose purpose is to destroy our American constitutional system of government.

Mr. Speaker, this Communist publication indicates that the Communists in the United States are linked directly to the Communists in Soviet Russia and that they aim by revolution to transform our American constitutional democracy into a collective Soviet state, destroy lives and savings of our people, penalize success, discourage thrift, destroy private business enterprise and sacred rights and liberties while smothering the vital energies of a free people and shackling them in bonds of regimented political and economic slavery.

The record reveals that the Communists in Russia have effaced in blood every trace of justice, liberty, morality, and individual human and private property rights. We know that the Communists in all lands including the United States openly proclaim their loyalty to the hammer and sickle red flag and regard Moscow as the world capital and Red Soviet Russia as their fatherland. This attitude harmonizes with the international character of the constitution of the Soviet Union adopted in Moscow in 1923, the first article of which describes the world as a battlefield divided between socialism and capitalism. The record also conclusively proves that the Communists in Russia have not only repealed the Ten Commandments of the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, but have confiscated private property, destroyed sacred rights and liberties, and the lives of millions of people in order to chain the living in bonds of gangster autocracy.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the record I believe that there is no more fitting way to uphold, defend, and preserve our American constitutional form of Government with its sacred rights and liberties than to overwhelmingly vote for this bill to deport Harry Bridges, to the end "that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth" as nobly said by the martyred Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to pause for a moment and analyze the procedure that we are following here and then ask ourselves the question as to whether or not we should feel ashamed of ourselves.

We are asking that the Congress of the United States, in all its dignified might, direct the deportation of one individual. The only basis upon which that request is being made is a statement contained in the supplemental report accompanying the bill to the effect that Bridges is regarded by the framers of this bill as a menace to the interests of this country. In other words, we are asked to deport one individual—all of Congress against this one individual—based on the conclusion contained in the report from this

committee. Bridges was not given any hearing before the Committee on Immigration. He was not permitted to be heard before the Rules Committee. This is the first time in the history of this country that a man is being convicted and sentenced without being given an opportunity to defend himself. Any alien, no matter how heinous the crime may be for which he is being deported, is given a hearing. He is given a hearing before the immigration officials. Then that hearing is reviewed. It is reviewed before a Board of Appeals of the Labor Department. Then that alien has an opportunity to go to court and be heard on a writ of habeas corpus. But in this case no hearing, no opportunity to be heard at all was afforded, and we consider that perfectly sound American procedure. If that is sound American procedure and the majority of Congress is going to put its stamp of approval on this type of procedure, I do not believe I am mistaken when I say that the day is not far off when those same Members who put their stamp of approval on this procedure will be ashamed of the action that they are about to take today. We all know the real reason for this attempted deportation of Bridges. Bridges organized the workers on the west coast and made the labor exploiters pay decent wages. Now, taking advantage of the war hysteria, these same labor exploiters seek his deportation and use Congress for this foul job.

I have before me a letter from Harry Bridges. I think it is only fair that Bridges be accorded just this opportunity to have some Member of Congress read an answer to the charges that have been made against him. I now place this proposition before the House: I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I be permitted to read this letter, which is seven pages long, and that it not be taken out of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NICHOLS). The gentleman from New York asks permission to read a letter and that it not be taken out of the time for debate on this resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. DUNN. I would like to know if it is in order to make a motion to that effect?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that it can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, since objection has been heard—

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California withdraws his objection. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to comment on the objections that have been made to my request, but I do think that now it becomes very, very obvious to every Member in this Chamber that you are asked to convict and sentence a man without giving him an opportunity to even have a Member of Congress read a letter which presents his answer to the charges that have been made on the floor of the House, leave alone the fact that you have already denied him every opportunity to be heard.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I agree with the gentleman that he should be given an opportunity to read the letter, and I hope the gentleman will ask permission to read it under general debate.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I would be denied this privilege under general debate.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I want to suggest that the gentleman will have plenty of time to read that letter when the bill is being read, by striking out the last word, and I hope he does it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say to the gentleman that I will be in no different position then than I am now. When the bill is being read for amendment all I will have is 5 minutes and I will have to make the same request which has been objected to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. All right. Let us proceed with the legislative lynching.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection, to the gentleman's request.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] be allowed to proceed for 7 minutes without its being taken out of his time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has withdrawn his objection. Does the gentleman from New York wish to renew his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to read the letter dated June 1, comprising 7 pages, addressed to me by Harry Bridges.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object. This man has had too much time already, and the sooner you find that out the better.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. You would not hear him before the committee. Why? Do you not want the Congress to have his side before it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the gentleman from New York be given 15 minutes' additional time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman to make such a motion. Under the rules the time is controlled by the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from New York. The gentleman's motion is not in order. It can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order has been demanded. The regular order is, Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York to read this letter?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, the letter from Harry Bridges reads as follows:

INTERNATIONAL LONGSHOREMEN'S AND
WAREHOUSEMEN'S UNION,
San Francisco, Calif., June 1, 1940.

Hon. VITO MARCANTONIO,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My purpose in addressing this communication to you is in order that you may know certain facts concerning the attempts at my deportation and certain facts in connection with my official and personal background that may not be generally known.

First, as to my personal record in connection with citizenship. On March 26, 1940, Representative LELAND M. FORD placed a letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD including an article that appeared in the American Legion magazine. This letter was full of misstatements and inferences and unwarranted conclusions. The magazine article was a reprint from a metropolitan daily newspaper, the Capitol Daily, of Washington, D. C., of February 15, 1939, and the statement is made that this article itself provides sufficient evidence of my undesirability.

I first filed application papers for citizenship in 1921. In 1928, prior to the expiration of my papers, I filed for second or final papers in the city of San Francisco and, after the application had been sent to Washington, was notified to appear in the United States District Court in San Francisco with witnesses to receive my final papers.

I appeared with witnesses at the time and place indicated by the notice and was then notified by the local immigration authorities that all final steps, including the actual granting of final papers, must be taken prior to the expiration of first papers. I have the records to prove this, including the notice to appear at the district

court with a notation in red pencil on the notice by the immigration authorities to pay particular attention to the date as my papers expired soon.

The point is that I almost completed the getting of my final papers, even to appearing at court with witnesses. I have since been informed by my attorneys that the advice that I received at that time was faulty and that I was legally entitled to go ahead as long as my application for final papers was filed, as it was, prior to the expiration of the first papers.

Immediately following this I filed another application for citizenship papers but was forced, of course, to wait 2 years under the law until I could apply for second or final papers.

Two years later—that is, when it was time for me to again apply for second and final papers—the country as a whole and myself were affected by the depression. Very frankly, from 1930 and the following several years the necessary money, around \$20, to secure final papers was beyond my ability to raise.

I had been and was still in difficulties with the company union on the water front and suffered blacklisting and discrimination for that reason.

At that time it took me 2 or 3 weeks to earn \$20, and I had a wife and two children to support.

Late in 1932, September to be exact, and from then on through 1933 and 1934 my activities along organizational lines became very much the concern of the company union and the shipowners on the water front.

My second set of first papers expired in 1935. From 1933 on, I was active in union matters, and the union was engaged in a series of disputes with the shipowners. Because of my activities in these disputes, the shipowners were out to get me.

At the particular period my papers should have been procured the maritime unions were engaged in a sympathetic boycott or strike in support of British Columbia water front workers, and I, together with other officials, was called back to Washington, D. C., by Assistant Secretary of Labor Edward F. McGrady on this matter.

Incidentally, at this time I was publicly being accused of being a British secret agent concerned with disrupting American shipping to the advantage of British shipping inasmuch as British ships were able to ply to and from the ports of British Columbia but the American ships refused to handle strike-bound or unfair cargo in support of the striking B. C. workers.

All in all, at this time my own conclusions, together with advice and information from sources I had no reason to doubt, were that I would be denied citizenship if I attempted to complete my application, mainly for the reasons I have stated here.

There were other reasons, none of them, however, the reasons charged against me by my enemies.

In addition, numerous charges had already been made against me by employer groups, the American Legion subversive activities committee headed by one Harper Knowles, and others, and again it was definitely my opinion, based on advice of many to whom I went, that I would have a hard time procuring any citizenship papers until these charges were investigated by immigration authorities or some other governmental authority and I was cleared of these charges.

I was afraid to risk being refused citizenship, knowing that such refusal based on false statements would react against me and my union activities.

The American Legion article claims other acts that make me undesirable, namely, not behaving as a person of good moral character, and second, by swearing to false statements.

These charges are made on the basis of conclusions not drawn from facts but on baseless assumptions regarding my marriage and the legitimacy of my daughter.

The facts are as follows: I have two children—one a stepson and one my own daughter. My stepson, Kenneth McClellan, was born on July 27, 1916, in Marshfield, Oreg., and my daughter, Betty, was born December 26, 1924, in San Francisco. It should be noticed that the immigration official checking the records merely stated that he found no records and from this failure to find records the deduction is made that I am not married, and therefore my daughter is illegitimate. It is also claimed that I have made false statements, because on one set of papers I said I had one child and on the other set that I had two children.

It is correct that on one set of papers, the recent ones, I stated I had one child living at home, my own daughter. My stepson at that time had left home. He left home to join the United States Army, and in the last 2 or 3 weeks has just reenlisted for his second period and is now stationed at the San Francisco Presidio.

My marriage is legal. I have my marriage certificate. I should not be held responsible for failure of investigators working secretly to find such records. At no time was I asked or approached by any Government official to produce the records.

I might also mention that at no time did I make any effort to conceal anything from the local immigration authorities in San Francisco and that I sought their advice regarding the filling out of my application papers for citizenship.

Certain other matters should be mentioned. In addition to being an organizing force in the trade-union movement on the west coast, I have engaged in other forms of activity in connection with my official position.

No one can deny the improvement in the conditions of the maritime workers since they were organized. No one can deny that the organization of the longshoremen in 1934 led to the organization of all other maritime unions where before that time none existed. Through organization the Pacific coast longshoremen have won American wages, hours, and working conditions, and eliminated

longshore unemployment. The method of hiring and dispatching longshoremen to so equalize the work, create jobs, and relieve unemployment was made the subject of a study by the United States Government, and the conclusions reached by this study enthusiastically endorsed the progress made through waterfront organization and the beneficial effect on the maritime industry.

All charges of union dictatorship and gangsterism that have been made can best be answered by simply pointing out that I have taken the lead and been mainly responsible, together with other of our union leaders and members of the rank and file, in building what is, as far as we know, the most democratic union in the America labor movement.

All officials of our international union, including myself, are subject to an initiative petition of recall that can immediately remove us from office, upon being signed by any 15 percent of our membership in good standing.

The recall can remove any official, including myself without a trial and our union constitution prevents any retaliatory steps being taken against those persons or groups that initiate the recall petition. After the recall petition is circulated, the officials are immediately removed and then placed on trial. If necessary, the results of the trial can be referred by the petition signers to a secret ballot of our entire membership.

All officials including myself must be elected each year by a secret ballot of our entire membership and must receive a majority of all votes cast to be elected. Both primary and final elections are held in order to assure a majority of votes being received by the elected officials.

In the last 3 years I have been unopposed for office despite numerous nominations made against me, all of whom declined.

In addition to union activities, organizations, etc., given solely to the matters of hours, wages, and working conditions, we have also been in the forefront on issues of a somewhat different nature.

It is less than 2 years ago that I wired the President of the United States concerning Nazi spy and sabotage activity in west coast aircraft plants. I personally sat down with Congressman JERRY VOORHIS on this matter and did everything possible to bring it to the attention of the proper governmental authorities, including the Department of Justice. It was also brought to the attention of the Government that the brother of one of the German agents that was arrested in the New York spy ring some time ago was still at that time holding an important position in the Boeing Aircraft plant in Seattle, together with other Nazi bund members.

I attempted to bring to the attention of the Federal Government and also stated to Congressman VOORHIS that our union people in the aircraft plants had noticed that German and Japanese agents apparently buying airplanes had easy access to airplane manufacturing plants in California, whereas many American people were closely questioned and excluded from these plants.

It should be remembered that my telegram to the President of the United States concerning this Nazi activity was dispatched just a few hours prior to the crash of the Douglas plane at the Douglas flying field in southern California, when it developed that a so-called Douglas mechanic turned out to be a French Army officer flying in the plane in complete violation of the law. We knew at that time that the same had occurred with agents of other foreign governments.

During the Italian campaign in Ethiopia our men protested bitterly against the quantity of war materials that were being shipped over Pacific coast water fronts to the Italian forces and Government, although ostensibly destined for the Italian Red Cross.

On numerous occasions we bitterly opposed placing aboard American and Japanese ships huge shipments of scrap iron, airplane engines, chemicals, and other war materials for shipment to Japan to be used against defenseless and innocent Chinese people. Our men have handled, against their will, thousands of tons of this material, knowing well what it was to be used for, and knowing well that at some time in the future it might be returned to us from Japanese airplanes in the form of Japanese bombs and from Japanese cannon in the form of shells.

We have on numerous occasions done everything possible to bring to the attention of the public and authorities the extent of Japanese spy activities in the Pacific coast fishing fleets. We know and everyone should know that oceangoing fishing craft with a cruising radius of some 6,000 miles, powerful, up-to-date, two-way radios, better mine- and submarine-detecting equipment than is carried on United States naval craft, operate along the entire Pacific coast seaboard. On numerous occasions our fishermen organized into the C. I. O. have observed these craft in forbidden waters, such as naval anchorages, mine areas, etc.

My supporters in the union and I were of the opinion that the thorough airing of the charges in the 9 weeks' trial on Angel Island had cleared the way for me to gain citizenship. This hearing has been attacked as a "whitewash" on the part of Dean James M. Landis.

I need make no defense of Dean Landis, the Immigration Department, or any others concerned, but the fact remains that no one Government witness in the hearing could point to a single example, even though they were asked to, or any statement or action by me or our unions tending to undermine or overthrow the American form of government, or to any action of the unions that could be considered un-American.

The main witness who was employed by the steamship interests of the Pacific coast to build a case against me, no matter what methods must be used, we found impossible to get on the witness stand, namely, Stanley Morton Doyle, an employers' labor spy who

utilizes his badge of membership in the American Legion to cover and further carry on his activities.

The decision of Dean Landis, his reasons, and the record in this case speak for themselves. The charges were found to be merely hearsay charges originating with the employers' paid labor spies and agents and sympathetic officials in the police department and governmental agencies of some Pacific coast cities.

The point is made in connection with the present alien deportation bill that I admitted association with "known Communists."

Of course, being on the witness stand and under oath, I told the truth in every detail without attempting to evade any question. I explained that as the ranking official of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union and, in addition, as the west coast C. I. O. director of all the Pacific Coast States, it was my official duty to meet with politicians and persons representing every type of organization.

I can give instances where I have had associations with numerous political and religious leaders that did not at all commit me to their policies. The same is true as to meetings with any Communist officials. I accepted help from any source, including Communists, if I believed that such help was given in good faith and was of benefit to our union movement.

In not a single instance has it been shown that such associations were for any other purpose or used for any other purpose.

I should like to mention finally the fact that at present we are engaged in negotiations attempting to secure a contract covering longshore work on the Pacific coast. For some months past we have attempted to have American shipowners and operators execute a contract for a period of at least 3 to 5 years, aimed at preventing any stoppages of work or strikes between longshoremen and employers for this length of time.

Our union membership and I well know that the present attempts to railroad me out of the country simply because I am undesirable to a minority group of American people is being used to prevent the successful negotiating of this contract.

I have never been, and I am not now, concerned with my own personal welfare in these matters. In 1934 I was offered, first, \$50,000, and then an offer to name my own price if I would betray the union. This offer came from those interests who have constantly sought my deportation under false charges.

I am a resident in this country by choice, not by accident, and I am very familiar with American institutions, civil liberties, and American democracy, and I appreciate and support them.

I myself sought the investigation and hearing by the Government into the charges against me with a view of getting them out of the way so that I could complete my citizenship. Those forces that howl so much against my not being a citizen are the same forces that will leave no stone unturned to prevent me from becoming naturalized.

The passage of the Allen bill will be a victory for powerful minority forces. It will certainly not be a defeat for me or what I represent. The defeat will be to American civil liberties and democracy and will be looked back on in the future, if successful, as such acts that occurred in the last World War were ultimately regarded, such as the changing of the name of "hamburger" steak to "liberty" steak, etc.

In concluding this somewhat lengthy communication I merely want to repeat what I said at the outset, that I believe that the Representatives in Congress should know the facts of this case. The facts as I have stated them here are correct and are a matter of official record in some form or another.

With the personal appreciation of myself and the full appreciation of our union membership for your past efforts on our behalf, I trust that everything possible will be done in the interests of the American labor movement and American democracy to prevent the passage of this piece of private-interests legislation.

Very truly yours,

H. R. BRIDGES, President.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. If I have any time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how the time stands?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Mississippi has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD].

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, particularly the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], I may say that he is not the first man who has been misled by Harry Bridges.

I believe that Harry Bridges is one of the most destructive labor leaders who has ever hit the United States. Many good labor people have been misled by Mr. Bridges.

I think Dean Landis, wherein he sought to whitewash but did not exonerate Harry Bridges, had to go to great lengths to make the decision he did; and I am going to quote some page numbers wherein you may verify that. See footnotes and pages 122, 124, 125 clear through to page 151 of the

Landis report where he refused to deny his communism. Time will not permit me to go into this as much as I would like to. I just want to say that the gentleman from New York read a lot of words into the Record, but not a word in Harry Bridges' defense. He did not present it because he did not have any, he just simply did not have any, and I am going to read the record on this, too. He went to great lengths to say that the Department of Immigration did not know anything about his marriage. Of course, the Department of Immigration would not know, but he did not say anything about the registrar of vital statistics. I am going to read the record. On May 7, 1920, Harry Bridges came to the United States and registered as an alien. On July 13, 1921, he filed his first papers for application for American citizenship. On August 9, 1928, he again filed his first papers. Now, there was a reason for that. He did not mention marriage in his first application. He got afraid. There was a very logical reason why he filed again. This time making his declaration before the clerk of the United States District Court of Northern California, he stated under oath that he was married and that his wife's name was Agnes McClay Bridges. That was in 1928. On May 2, 1936, 8 years later, he filled out a preliminary form for declaration of intention and signed it. In the above form he stated that he was married on May 1, 1934, at San Francisco. Bridges stated that he was married on December 2, 1923, under the name of Harry Renton Bridges to Agnes McClay Bridges.

We had this matter looked up by the registrar of vital statistics of California, whose duty it is to find out these things, and here is what he says:

There is no record in California of Harry Renton Bridges and Agnes Bridges, or McClay, having been married either on December 2, 1927, May 1, 1934, or on any other date between July 1905 and June 30, 1938.

There is your answer to Mr. Bridges' defense. That is the complete statement. He could not defend himself because he did not have any defense.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. No.

Mr. GEYER of California. I thought so.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. You just thought so to get your nose in.

Mr. GEYER of California. I think—

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is: The gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] will proceed.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Now this man comes before us and he hollers and he screams for his rights under the Constitution of the United States. I read into the record, in the N. L. R. B. hearings, some of the letters written by his crowd, in which he said to business:

We are going to call on you, and your men are going to come peacefully to our union, or, if they do not, it is just going to be too bad.

I also read in here the letters that went to the workers:

You are going to come into our union; and if you do not come in peacefully, you had better take a look at some others who refused to come in.

And those others had broken arms, their own arms broken over their knees, or jaws with broken bones that stuck out in two or three places—injuries inflicted by the thugs of Harry Renton Bridges. I ask you what consideration did he give to the rights of others? It seems to me that in this country individual right is interpreted to mean that you may do what you wish to do provided you do not infringe on the rights of others.

Here is a man who has no respect for others. In sit-down strikes, like in the Douglas strike, they moved into those plants; they got into those plants and sat there. They did not own those plants. I ask you, is that due process of law when you take possession of the other fellow's property? You people scream for the rights of Harry Bridges; you scream for the rights of these others, but I ask you to square the actions of those men with their requests for recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry I have not 25 minutes longer to discuss this matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, George Washington, the Father of his Country, made a strikingly significant and unforgettable statement when he said:

Citizens by birth or choice of a common country; that country has a right to concentrate your affections.

We are increasingly becoming aware in this Nation that there are far too many individuals who, with lying tongue and false prophecy, are spreading discord in the ranks of labor, bringing about unnecessary strikes, and tearing apart the solidarity of the American system of government. [Applause.]

AFFIRMATIVE NOTICE WILL BE SERVED

The Congress of the United States, by favorable action on the bill to bring about the deportation of Harry R. Bridges, will serve notice, not only to him but other thousands in this country, that we are finally alert to this problem. Far, far too many of such persons are allowed to continue to live in the Republic and accept the privileges, the profits, and the protection of America, but assume none of the responsibilities of citizenship at the same time. [Applause.]

Facts will be adduced in the debate later today which will bring clearly to our attention and to the attention of the citizenry of this Republic the reason why favorable action on this measure should be speedily forthcoming. In many States of the Union there are large populations of aliens, and I want to make myself clear on that score.

NATURALIZED CITIZENS ARE VALUABLE

Naturalized citizens are just as important to America as are native-born citizens. I have aided scores of men and women to receive their papers of naturalized citizenship. I know their loyalty and faith centers in the United States. They join hands today in patriotic union with native-born citizens as we all awaken to the fact that aliens are besmirching the good name of those who are responsive to the challenge of real citizenship. All of us are descended from those who came to our shores, either at an early or late date, and in fighting for true Americanism we fight in a common cause. In the State of Pennsylvania, to cite an example, there are today reported to be 130,000 aliens. That is not the most disturbing figure. It is that only 21 percent of those 130,000 individuals have even signified or declared their intention of becoming citizens of the country in which they reside. The percentage is believed to be approximately correct. What about the 79 percent? What is their answer? Those individuals have remained as residents of the United States on an average of from 15 to 17 years. That is a tragic situation.

AMERICA FOR AMERICANS

Mr. Speaker, today there is more at stake than merely acting on the case of Harry R. Bridges. There is a call to the membership of this House, regardless of party, to so publicize our position clearly at this hour that the country and the world will know that we have come to the time in the history of this Nation when we mean to make America safe for Americans. [Applause.]

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that Mr. Bridges has not had his day in court. He is having his day in court in the only forum in this land which has the right to enact laws defining the rights of an alien to come in here and his right to remain. He is here by sufferance, not by right. We have the undoubted right to say that an alien shall not come in. Coupled with that is the right to say when one is undesirable we may put him out.

A reference has been made here to the finding of Mr. Landis. I have read Mr. Landis' report upon the record made in that case, and the findings and opinion of Mr. Landis are the finest example of a constipation of ideas and a diarrhea of words that I ever saw in my life. As a matter of fact and of law, it is hard to prove some offences of which men are guilty. One

of those offences is fraud, which is akin to the activities of Mr. Bridges since he has been here. One great judge once said that—

Fraud is hatched in secret; it hides in the hollow of a tree, and, like a snail, it must be trailed by the slime which it leaves behind.

The facts of the Bridges investigation amply justified Mr. Landis in ordering his deportation. That he is a Communist is shown by his associations, his subversive activities, and his devious moves with respect to naturalization. He has "wormed in and wormed out and endeavored to leave everyone in doubt as to whether the snake that made the track was coming in or backing out." It would be interesting to inquire just what state of facts would lead Mr. Landis to conclude that an undesirable alien should be deported. The anomalous thing about a man like Bridges is that he assails with pick and crowbar the foundations of our institutions, then when he is caught in un-American activities he flees to the courts and lays hold of the horns of the altar and appeals to the laws and institutions which he seeks in season and out of season to destroy.

As a matter of fact, this is a long-delayed action. Bridges has sinned away his day of grace. His deportation is long overdue. It is the beginning of what must be a concerted move on the part of the Congress, and that is to delouse the body of Uncle Sam of these undesirable aliens like Bridges. [Applause.] Then, when we have done that, let us give the body politic a good, strong dose of legalistic vermifuge and clean out the internal parasites that now afflict us. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DRES]. [Applause.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, from the testimonies of former members of the Communist Party who sat with Harry Bridges in Communist meetings, from his own public statements, and from information which has come to me from reliable sources, I am convinced that Harry Bridges is a Communist and, therefore, subject to deportation. My opinion is not based upon biased testimony or hearsay evidence, and it is confirmed by the fact that Bridges has religiously followed the Communist Party line. Naturally, it is difficult to prove by membership books the affiliation of any Communist with the party. This is because the Communist Party conceals its records and, under existing laws, we are unable to compel them to produce these records. It is also the practice of the party to classify certain influential members as members at large, known only to the top-ranking Communists in this country and in Russia. The evidence received by our committee justifies and compels the finding that Bridges is a Communist and an undesirable alien. He should have been deported years ago. When Secretary Perkins selected Mr. Landis to pass upon this question, I predicted that Bridges would not be deported. No one will deny that there was ample evidence before Mr. Landis to authorize the deportation of Bridges.

Bridges could have been deported under existing laws and, in the interest of America, he should have been deported. As an alien, he occupies the status of a guest. The courts have held repeatedly that Congress has a right to terminate the stay of an alien guest at any time and for any reason. The argument that this bill is unconstitutional is without merit. If I thought for a moment that it was unconstitutional or came under the classification of bills of attainder, I would vote against it. I do not believe that we should violate the Constitution or the Bill of Rights in our determination to rid this country of undesirable aliens, but the status of an alien is wholly different from that of a citizen. It is unfortunate that we have been compelled to resort to a private bill to expel Bridges from this country. It should have been done by the Secretary of Labor in the enforcement of existing laws. It is also regrettable that we cannot secure additional legislation along the lines of the bill which I recently introduced, which would make it mandatory for the Department of Justice to deport all undesirable aliens in this country. But since the laws were not enforced and it is improbable that we can secure the necessary general legislation at this session there is no other alternative left to the Congress. The very people

who are opposing this bill have favored or introduced similar bills to exempt aliens from deportation. They have gone on record in favor of withholding the deportation of aliens who are mandatorily deportable and have been ordered deported by the Department of Labor.

I do not think that it can be justly said that the deportation of Harry Bridges constitutes punishment. He has shown that he does not appreciate the hospitality which America has extended to him as a guest. He has shown that he does not believe in our form of government, and he has not hesitated to denounce it. In view of this attitude, it should be a favor to Mr. Bridges to get him out of a country that he does not like. It is fairly certain that passage of this bill in the Senate will be prevented. But favorable action by the House will serve notice upon the enforcement agencies of our Government that the Congress is determined to rid this country of undesirable aliens. This will have a wholesome effect upon the entire country, and it will remove any doubt in the minds of any Government official with respect to the overwhelming desire of the American people to expel Communist, Fascist, and Nazi aliens.

Harry Bridges has become a symbol of the kind of aliens who are not wanted in America. The passage of this bill by an overwhelming vote may bring about a fearless and honest enforcement of our deportation laws.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 351, nays 21, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

YEAS—351

Alexander	Case, S. Dak.	Fitzpatrick
Allen, Ill.	Celler	Flaherty
Allen, La.	Chapman	Flannery
Allen, Pa.	Chipfield	Ford, Leland M.
Andersen, H. Carl	Church	Ford, Miss.
Anderson, Mo.	Clark	Fries
Andersen, A. H.	Clason	Fulmer
Andrews	Claypool	Gamble
Angell	Clevenger	Garrett
Arends	Cluett	Gartner
Arnold	Cochran	Gathings
Austin	Coffee, Nebr.	Gavagan
Ball	Coffee, Wash.	Gearhart
Barnes	Cole, Md.	Gehrmann
Barry	Colmer	Gerlach
Barton, N. Y.	Cooper	Gibbs
Bates, Mass.	Corbett	Gifford
Beam	Costello	Gilchrist
Beckworth	Courtney	Gillie
Bell	Cox	Goodwin
Bender	Cravens	Gore
Blackney	Crawford	Gossett
Bland	Creal	Graham
Bloom	Crowe	Grant, Ala.
Boehne	Crowthier	Grant, Ind.
Boland	Cullen	Green
Bolles	Cummings	Gregory
Bolton	Curtis	Griffith
Boren	D'Alesandro	Gross
Boykin	Delaney	Guyer, Kans.
Bradley, Mich.	Dempsey	Gwynne
Bradley, Pa.	Dies	Hall, Edwin A.
Brewster	Dingell	Hall, Leonard W.
Brooks	Dirksen	Halleck
Brown, Ga.	Disney	Hancock
Brown, Ohio	Ditter	Hare
Bryson	Dondero	Harness
Buck	Doxey	Harrington
Buckley, Minn.	Dworshak	Hart
Bulwinkle	Eaton	Harter, N. Y.
Burdick	Edmiston	Harter, Ohio
Burgin	Elliot	Hartley
Byrne, N. Y.	Ellis	Hawks
Byrns, Tenn.	Elston	Healey
Byron	Engel	Hendricks
Caldwell	Englebright	Hennings
Camp	Evans	Hill
Cannon, Fla.	Faddis	Hinsbaw
Cannon, Mo.	Fenton	Hoffman
Carlson	Ferguson	Holmes
Carter	Fernandez	Hope
Cartwright		Horton

McGehee	O'Leary	Routzohn	Taber
McGregor	Oliver	Rutherford	Talle
McKeough	O'Neal	Ryan	Tarver
McLaughlin	Osmer	Sandager	Taylor
McLean	O'Toole	Sasser	Terry
McLeod	Pace	Schafer, Wis.	Thill
McMillan, Clara	Parsons	Schiffler	Thomas, N. J.
McMillan, John L.	Patman	Schuetz	Thomas, Tex.
Maclejewski	Patton	Schulte	Thomason
Magnuson	Pearson	Schwert	Thorkelson
Mahon	Peterson, Fla.	Scrugham	Tibbott
Maloney	Peterson, Ga.	Seccombe	Tinkham
Mansfield	Pierce	Secrest	Treadway
Marshall	Pittenger	Seger	Van Zandt
Martin, Ill.	Plumley	Shafer, Mich.	Vinson, Ga.
Martin, Iowa	Poage	Shanley	Vorys, Ohio
Martin, Mass.	Polk	Shannon	Vreeland
Mason	Powers	Sheppard	Ward
Massingale	Rabaut	Short	Warren
May	Ramspeck	Simpson	Weaver
Michener	Randolph	Smith, Maine	West
Mills, Ark.	Rankin	Smith, Ohio	Wheat
Mills, La.	Rayburn	Smith, Wash.	Wheelchel
Mitchell	Reece, Tenn.	Smith, W. Va.	White, Ohio
Monkiewicz	Reed, Ill.	Snyder	Whittington
Moser	Reed, N. Y.	Somers, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Mouton	Rees, Kans.	South	Williams, Del.
Mundt	Rich	Sparkman	Williams, Mo.
Murdock, Ariz.	Richards	Spence	Winter
Murray	Robinson, Utah	Springer	Wolcott
Myers	Robson, Ky.	Starnes, Ala.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Nelson	Rockefeller	Stegall	Wolverton, N. J.
Nichols	Rodgers, Pa.	Stearns, N. H.	Woodruff, Mich.
Norrell	Rogers, Mass.	Stefan	Youngdahl
O'Brien	Rogers, Okla.	Sumner, Ill.	Zimmerman
O'Connor	Romjue	Sweet	

NAYS—21

Casey, Mass.	Ford, Thomas F.	Marcantonio	Smith, Ill.
Connery	Geyer, Calif.	Miller	Voorhis, Calif.
Dickstein	Havener	Murdock, Utah	Wadsworth
Dunn	Hobbs	O'Day	
Eberharter	Izac	Sheridan	
Edelstein	Keller	Smith, Conn.	

NOT VOTING—59

Anderson, Calif.	Drewry	McArdle	Smith, Va.
Barden, N. C.	Duncan	McGranery	Sullivan
Bates, Ky.	Durham	Maas	Summers, Tex.
Buckley, N. Y.	Fay	Merritt	Sutphin
Burch	Fish	Monroney	Sweeney
Cole, N. Y.	Flannagan	Mott	Tenerowicz
Collins	Folger	Norton	Tolan
Cooley	Hess	Patrick	Vincent, Ky.
Crosser	Hook	Pfeifer	Wallgren
Culkin	Houston	Risk	Walter
Darden, Va.	Jacobsen	Robertson	Welch
Darrow	Jenks, N. H.	Sabath	White, Idaho
DeRouen	Kean	Sacks	Wood
Doughton	Kirwan	Satterfield	Woodrum, Va.
Douglas	Lemke	Schaefer, Ill.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
General pairs:

Mr. Fay with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Barden of North Carolina with Mr. Mott.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Darden of Virginia with Mr. Andrews of California.
Mr. Hook with Mr. Darrow.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Risk.
Mr. Robertson with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Houston with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Monroney.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Summers of Texas.
Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. Bates of Kentucky.
Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Tolan.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Folger.
Mr. Collins with Mr. McArdle.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Wallgren.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Duncan.
Mr. McGranery with Mr. Tenerowicz.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Patrick.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. DeRouen.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Sachs.
Mr. Durham with Mr. White of Idaho.

Mr. CONNERY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "yea."

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman qualify?

Mr. FISH. No, Mr. Speaker; I do not qualify.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague—

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that I shall have to object to any statement as to how a colleague would have voted if present.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. KEAN—

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am sorry to have to object to any announcements as to how colleagues would have voted. It is a flagrant violation of the rules of the House, is unfair to other absent Members, places a trying obligation on spokesmen for other delegations, wastefully consumes the valuable time of the House, cumbers the RECORD, encourages delinquency, is in effect proxy voting, against which there is strict law, and, in addition, renders no real service to the absent Member whose solicitous colleague, usually without his knowledge or consent, impose on the Speaker and the House by making such announcements. In response to sentiment throughout the membership of the House, I am constrained to raise the point of order against all such inconsiderate, unwarranted, and unwanted breaches of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects to such announcements.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9766) to authorize the deportation of Harry Renton Bridges.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great interest in this bill, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be extended 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RAYBURN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it is very necessary in order that the program may go along that the consideration of this bill be completed today. Under the rule, there is an hour of general debate, which would certainly take until 4:15 to conclude. There will be at least two roll calls, I understand, on the motion to recommit and on the passage of the bill. This would run us up until in the neighborhood of 5:30 even though there were no debate under the 5-minute rule. I understand several amendments are to be offered. If the time for general debate is extended, we may be here until 6 or 7 o'clock. As far as I am individually concerned, I am not going to object, but I do want to call attention to the situation.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9766, with Mr. CALDWELL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

When the bill was introduced for deportation of Harry Bridges, the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization discussed this question at its several committee meetings, and by majority vote, voted the bill out for further consideration of the House.

In the discussion by members of the committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the committee members had not been satisfied with the findings of the Secretary of Labor and feel that if private bills are passed by Congress for relief of aliens, then that Congress has the same power to deport undesirable aliens.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the bill which we are today considering, proposes to deport immediately

the famous alien, Harry Renton Bridges. His activities are known all over the United States. Incidentally, I understand that he has sometimes given his name as "Albert" instead of "Harry." But a whole Nation knows the person against whom this bill is directed.

Four times the Immigration Committee has had this bill before it, and each time a vote was taken either upon the bill as a whole or upon some phase of the legislation—and let it be said to the eternal credit of that committee that in spite of all the pressure that has been brought to bear to stop this bill, the committee never wavered in the least. When the roll is called today, I think you will still find every member of the committee standing behind the bill except two. I am especially indebted to my colleague JAMES VAN ZANDT for his able assistance and full cooperation in this matter.

The Immigration Committee went almost in a body to the Rules Committee and that fine committee also took a courageous position and granted a rule by a unanimous vote to bring the bill to the floor of the House.

I desire to pay tribute here to my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi, BILL COLMER, who handled the bill for the Rules Committee on the floor. He remained steadfast in his determination to press for action on this bill and rendered invaluable service not only to his own Rules Committee but to the entire Congress. He deserves the gratitude and support of patriotic Americans for his vigorous action and able support of this bill and other legislation to rid America of undesirable aliens.

And so, today we have the bill here. I think the Members of this House are sufficiently aware of the tremendous pressure that has been brought to bear to keep the bill from coming to a vote. I have been astounded at the influence and strength manifested by elements seeking to destroy this legislation. I have been receiving a great deal of correspondence from all over the United States on this bill and I am happy to say that the writers, for the most part, are anxious to see the bill passed. However, I have received some very severe criticism from Communists and their sympathizers. The following quotation from a letter is typical:

By your introduction of the bill to deport Harry Bridges you have started an action which may finish your political career. The C. I. O. will help to retire you to political oblivion.

My answer to that, Mr. Chairman, is that I am going to place my country first and I will not be intimidated by Communists, Nazis, Fascists, nor any other subversive element bent upon destroying our country.

Mr. Chairman, if certain high public officials had discharged their plain duty, there would have been no necessity for this bill. We had hoped that Mme. Perkins would change her attitude toward the undesirable alien question, but our hope was in vain. Finally, the President, evidently noting the increasing resentment in Congress and in the country toward the Secretary of Labor, removed the Bureau of Immigration from the safe haven of that official. I believe that the introduction of this bill contributed to that decision and has thus served a very useful purpose. I trust that the situation will be better in the Justice Department; certainly, it could not be worse.

If I correctly read the mind of Congress on this question dealing with undesirable aliens and subversive elements, Congress is tired of the sham that has been perpetrated upon the American people, and I believe that it is ready to take such action as it necessary to remedy this situation. Let us in this bill solemnly but courageously notify not only Harry Bridges, but all of his kind, that America cannot and will not tolerate them. Let them know that Congress has a way, or will make a way, to protect America. Let the message go to Hitler, to Stalin, and to Mussolini that their parachutists will not land in the waiting and welcome arms of those who would destroy this Republic. Let us see to it that if they undertake to land here the reception committee will consist of good, honest-to-God Americans, appropriately dressed and properly outfitted to give them such a reception that even the "Mad Man of Munich" may not fail to understand.

Here today is an opportunity to translate into action the verbal protests which have been rising from all over America. We are called upon to answer a universal demand. Failure to take decisive, affirmative action to rid this country of undesirable aliens will meet the condemnation which it deserves. A vote against this bill today will properly be construed as a license to these undesirable alien elements to pursue their dirty work of striking down America from the rear. I cannot overemphasize the importance of this vote and what it means to the security of our Nation. It is a direct step, a bold action, to route the enemy within. The fact that it is new is no argument against it. To the charge that the remedy is drastic, I answer that the disease is serious. Ask the bleeding nations of Europe, overrun by enemy aliens, if they would consider the remedy too drastic. The fact that the Maritime Federation of the Pacific, largely controlled by Bridges, went on record a few days ago in opposition to the defense program speaks for itself. But I say to him and his kind that we are rearming so that this land of the free will never become a part of the Russian Soviet Union. We have been called upon even this week to vote billions of dollars to defend this country and the Congress has cheerfully done so. It is as necessary to rid this country of enemies within as it is to arm to protect it from the enemy without. So, Mr. Chairman, this is purely an American bill. It was introduced in the American Congress, to be voted upon by Americans for the American Nation. Let no man evade his responsibility today. There is no middle ground. Pretext will satisfy neither the conscience nor the people. We have just witnessed the fall of Norway, Belgium, Holland, and Luxemburg—accomplished largely by the work of alien enemies. The great French people, stabbed in the back, today are struggling against insurmountable odds, and perhaps before the sun sets, Hitler may be marching through the streets of Paris. Gentlemen of the Congress, this is no time to temporize, no time to theorize, no time to speculate. Selfish ambition and desire should go. One motive and only one motive is worthy in this House today, and that is to do the thing that is best for America.

Whence comes the defense of Harry Bridges and other alien enemies? What voices are raised for them? Can any person say that Harry Bridges wants to defend America? Does he love America? Will he fight for our institutions? Nay, gentlemen. Read the record in this case. It is bristling with evidence which leads me to the irresistible conclusion that Harry Bridges was and is a Communist. The evidence is as clear as the noonday sun that he is a very undesirable alien. Even the report of Dean Landis is most damaging to Bridges. I quote from the dean's report, and he certainly put it in the most favorable light possible for Bridges:

There is no doubt but that Bridges had at that time (1934) and has since, friends and associates who are Communists. At no time was he hesitant to admit these associations nor to deny that on occasion he has sought the help of the Communist Party.

Bridges has also refused to adopt any policy whereby his unions would exclude or discriminate against any person upon the ground of membership in the Communist Party. * * * Bridges offered no apologies for the Communists that were in his unions. He regarded them, in the main, as "militant and sincere" and as good union men.

Bridges admitted that he had occasionally dropped in at the Communists' headquarters when they were at 37 Grove Street, but that all he had done on those occasions was to purchase some pamphlets at the bookstore that they maintained in that building.

Time does not permit me to go into the evidence offered by the Government. To my notion, that was conclusive that he was a Communist in belief, in sympathy, and in action. Here is a case of a man who has been in this country more than 20 years and has never made a serious attempt to become a citizen of the United States. The Dies committee, which has rendered a great patriotic service to America, took a great deal of testimony upon the Bridges case, and all of that testimony was incorporated in and made a part of the hearings by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House. No fair-minded person can read that report, I think, without reaching the conclusion that Bridges is not only a dangerous radical alien, wholly undesirable as a citizen, but also a Communist.

Mr. Chairman, this House will without doubt take this important step to defend America. I want the vote to be decisive. I want it to be a warning to those who come here and abuse the privileges of American hospitality. [Applause.]

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to summarize the Bridges case for the benefit of the Members of the House as calmly and as dispassionately as I know how to do it, and this summary is based upon the evidence that is contained in the records of the Dies Committee.

First. Bridges is an alien, a guest within our gates, and he has become, by his actions, a very undesirable guest, as judged by a great majority of the American people. To illustrate, if I am a guest in your home and I criticize the way you run your home and I demand that you change the method of operation in your home, you have the right to say to me as your guest, "If you do not like the way I run my home, you should get out."

Now, a guest in your home only has the privileges that you grant to that guest. He has no rights as a member of the family, and an alien only has privileges granted to him and no rights by virtue of being a citizen.

Second. Bridges, according to the evidence, is a Communist and has advocated the overthrow of this Government by force. Twice he has been picked up to face deportation proceedings and the first time the proceedings were canceled by the Secretary of Labor. The second time the proceedings were postponed, waiting a decision from the Supreme Court in the Strecker case.

Now, to the lawyers in this House the Strecker case was not a parallel case to the Bridges case. The Strecker case was based entirely upon past membership in the Communist Party and whether past membership in the Communist Party was a deportable offense under our laws. The Supreme Court ruled that it was not, and therefore the Bridges case was brought to trial. But was it brought to trial in front of the court—the Federal court—and the Federal judge by whom Bridges was to be tried?

No; that Federal judge had ordered the deportation of others that were indicted before that court for the same offenses that Bridges was indicted, and the Department of Labor demanded a special judge in this case, and Judge Landis, the dean of the Harvard Law School, and I am told, one of the best legal minds in the United States, was selected as the trial judge. The Department of Labor, through its agents, prosecuted the case. The Department of Labor presented much flimsy and contradictory evidence in the case before Judge Landis, and the Department of Labor neglected to present real evidence that was available in that case, and Judge Landis, as any other judge, cannot go beyond the evidence presented in his court in deciding the case. He must decide it upon the evidence presented and Judge Landis decided that the case against Bridges as to being a Communist, was not substantiated by the evidence presented to him and he cleared Bridges of that indictment and therefore Bridges was permitted to go free.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this bill when it reaches that final action. I shall vote for it, despite the fact that there may be serious question in the minds of some lawyers as to what ultimate decision may be made of it should it finally be enacted into law when it reaches the Supreme Court of the United States. The subject is one for intrigue to a lawyer to investigate and study whether or not this proposed legislation may be in contravention and in violation of the Constitution. However, my own studies upon the subject as a lawyer have convinced me that if the matter is finally fairly presented to the Supreme Court there is a fair chance that the Court will hold this legislation to be constitutional, and for that reason I intend to support it.

There is another reason why I intend to support this legislation, and that is because it shall serve as a notice to the people of America that the Congress of the United States

is finally, and at last, going to respond to the demands of the people that something be done to rid our Nation of those who are out to destroy it. [Applause.] Would you expect Harry Renton Bridges to admit that he is a Communist? No. I am surprised that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], in reading the statement that was presented to him by Harry Bridges, did not investigate a little bit further into the situation in connection with the report of Judge Landis, and had he done so he would have very clearly found that from the mouth of Harry Bridges himself he made admissions before the committees of this Congress in which he admitted his cooperation with Communists. Moreover—

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman mentioned my name.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman's name has been mentioned many times, and I expect will be mentioned many times more in connection with this throughout the entire country. I ask the gentleman to let me finish. I refuse to yield. If you read the report of Judge Landis you will observe that one of the bases for the charge by the Department of Labor for his deportation was that he had become affiliated with Communist organizations. Judge Landis listened to the testimony on the subject of his affiliations, and he also listened to the testimony on the subject of his membership. He found that he was not a member and further found that he had not been affiliated with Communist organizations under the very strained and technical rules of law by which he interpreted the use of the term "affiliation"; and you will find his discussion in that regard on page 133 of his report, in which he uses these words:

Persons engaged in bitter industrial struggles tend to seek help and assistance from every available source. But the intermittent solicitation and acceptance of such help must be shown to have ripened into those bonds of mutual cooperation and alliance that entail continuing reciprocal duties and responsibilities before they can be deemed to come within the statutory requirement of affiliation.

And he held that there was no evidence to show that there was cooperation between Harry Bridges and the Communist Party, and as the basis of that he held that there was no proof of an alliance between Bridges and the Communist Party. Harry Bridges was before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in May.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 more minute.

Mr. KEEFE. When he was before that committee he was examined by members of that committee, including the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] and the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN]. He said in answer to questions which were asked him:

Mr. BOYKIN. Have you ever counseled with them—referring to Communists—or cooperated with them?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have.

That will be found in the record of the proceedings, and there from the mouth of Harry Bridges himself is his own statement that he not only has counseled with Communists in connection with his work as a labor leader, but that he cooperated with them, the very thing that Judge Landis used as the basis of his decision in holding that he was not affiliated with the Communist Party. I take it from the mouth of Harry Bridges himself. [Applause.]

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the question of doubt raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], in respect to the constitutionality of this action is best answered by Mr. Justice Brandeis in the case recorded in Two Hundred and Fifty-ninth United States Reports, page 276, May 29, 1922. This is Mr. Justice Brandeis talking:

Congress has power to order at any time the deportation of aliens whose presence in the country it deems hurtful and may do so by appropriate executive proceedings.

Similar language was used by the Court on May 12, 1913, in the case of *Bagajewitz v. Adams* (228 U. S. 585) in which Mr. Justice Holmes used the following language as reported on page 591:

It is thoroughly established that Congress has power to order the deportation of aliens whose presence in the country it deems hurtful.

Here are the opinions of two outstanding liberals which I deem to be squarely in point on the issue before us.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHERIDAN].

Mr. SHERIDAN. Mr. Chairman, I have sat here for many months watching my colleagues in the House, and I think I will take this occasion to disagree with the potential majority vote on this bill. I cannot reconcile myself to the position that where a man has been tried under our Federal constituted jurisdiction and procedure and found not guilty that this House should deport him. I do not think there is one man in this House who questions the integrity of Dean Landis, of the Harvard Law School. If he did, I do not think there is a Harvard man who would permit his—Dean Landis'—continuance in that high position. I may say for your information I am not a Harvard man.

I sometimes wonder whether you are fair and honest, because I do not know Bridges from Adam; but why take these proceedings piecemeal? How many Members of this House have read the incorporated report upon which Dean Landis has predicated his decision? I will wager not 10 percent of the House has read it. He was in a position to see the demeanor and the facial expression of the witnesses appearing before him. Many of the witnesses were perjurers and paid witnesses, as disclosed by the testimony. Upon that testimony you want to deport Bridges. It is not Bridges that is involved here. It is the American principle, our procedure of government. If we pass this bill, it will be an indelible blot upon this House, not on Bridges, because I do not think this bill will ever pass the Senate. That is my own conclusion. But we can never erase the blot on this House.

I heard my colleague from Wisconsin state "that the strange and technical principles of the law." I happen to be a lawyer myself. I know it always has been a principle of our law that he who affirms must prove. There is no duty devolving on Bridges or any other person who comes before our Federal procedure that he has to answer one iota. Many times, as lawyers, we assume the obligation of not putting our clients on the stand when we feel that the Government has not proved its case.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, for the first time in the history of our Government, Congress is called upon as representatives of the people to direct the Attorney General of the United States to deport without equivocation one who is recognized as an undesirable alien and a serious menace to the welfare of our Nation. Gentlemen, I refer to Harry Renton Bridges.

For years the American people have been menaced by the presence of such alien influences who have been permitted to spread their poisonous doctrines and false philosophies unmolested.

In the case of Harry Renton Bridges, public sentiment long ago demanded that he be deported. Why was he not deported? Simply because certain officials in responsible positions in our Government adopted a sympathetic attitude that ended with a complete whitewashing of charges that would have been sufficient cause for deporting anyone else so charged.

In considering this type of legislation there is unfolded before our eyes the workings of a real democracy. The American people, through their form of government, are immune from the wanton neglect of any appointed official to

discharge the duties of his office. Hence, Congress is called upon to recognize the will of the American people by deporting this undesirable alien.

This brazen individual has from time to time defied the American people by preaching doctrines that are incompatible with American institutions and the American way of life. He has had the gall to declare war against that great veteran organization—the American Legion—composed of more than a million men and women whose services during the last World War are a source of pride and honor in the history of our country.

The American Legion has a right to speak in defense of real Americanism because many of its members learned what it means to fear death in the form of an enemy submarine, a burst of shrapnel, the deadly fire of a machine gun, or the sudden explosion of a hand grenade. They know what it is to seek shelter from the hail of lead in the mud and filth of a stinking trench. They know the utter weariness and the hunger of suffering, of endless marches under the cover of darkness. They know, too, the scream of a dying comrade—crucified on a cross of barbed wire because he was willing to give his life to protect our Americanism.

The American Legion has no selfish interest in advocating that this so-called agent of Moscow be deported and is not alone in its crusade to ferret out individuals of his stripe.

The American Legion supports this bill and is upheld in its course by 99 percent of the American people. They know, and we Members of Congress should be quick to realize, that aliens of the Bridges type are accountable for the admitted existence in our country of such a despicable group as the "fifth column."

Every American citizen is conscious of the danger of the "fifth column," recalling with vivid memory the fate of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Belgium, Holland, Norway, and other countries. While it was Hitlerism in those lands, in this country it is the scourge of communism.

The adoption of this bill will sound the death knell to such vultures from Moscow who are bent on enjoying the privileges of a democracy, and, on the other hand, are engaged in destroying a form of government that represents a masterpiece of statesmanship.

The action of this House in approving this measure should also convey to the heads of our Government, and especially to the Department of Justice, that they must redouble their efforts to purge the Federal pay rolls of hundreds of Communist fellow travelers who openly boast of their affiliation with such Moscow-minded organizations while receiving their livelihood from the taxpayers of America.

These followers of Stalin who receive annual salaries ranging from \$1,080 to \$10,000, for a total of \$1,800,000, are a serious threat to not only our form of government but are preparing now to worm their way into responsible positions in the national-defense program.

Gentlemen, I repeat again, this is an eventful moment in the history of the United States. As representatives of the people, this Congress has a grave responsibility. By passing this bill we can demonstrate that we are alive to the danger that the "fifth column" presents to our national existence.

Our duty is clear and unmistakable. Let us move promptly in banishing from our shores such un-American trash that too long have been permitted to enjoy a hey-day at the expense of liberty-loving America.

On June 14 we as a nation will observe Flag Day and pay tribute to Old Glory. I can think of no greater observance than to rededicate ourselves to the principles for which our flag stands in keeping America for Americans, and thereby recall the words of Theodore Roosevelt:

Above all, we must stand shoulder to shoulder for the honor and greatness of our country.

[Applause.]

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDELSTEIN].

Mr. EDELSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I have been sitting here listening to those gentlemen who are in favor of the passage of this bill. Thus far I have heard nobody utter one word,

one fact which would justify the passage of this bill. Our duty as Members of the House of Representatives is to act upon legislation being considered by this body only after due deliberation and upon full information. I do not believe that anybody can reasonably say that this House is considering this bill with due deliberation and upon proper information.

I hold no brief for Bridges. Assuming that he is all the proponents of this bill claim that he is, the principle involved in the passage of this bill is more important than Bridges or a thousand Bridges. That principle is whether this House is proceeding, in the traditional, Democratic, American way, whether we are proceeding in accordance with the principles of justice and democracy which underlie consideration of all special legislation, for that is what this bill is. I am not concerned at this time with whether or not this bill is unconstitutional because it is a bill of attainder. We may be all convinced that it is, but I am willing to leave that for the decision of the Supreme Court, within whose jurisdiction it properly is. What I do object to is the establishment by this bill of a precedent which is dangerous, which is harmful, which is undemocratic, a precedent which is the first step along the road toward the adoption of that form of Government which now prevails on the greater part of the European continent. If we adopt this bill, if we can do this to Bridges now, there is no reason why we cannot do it to anybody else with or without a reason. That, I say, is the principle involved in the matter now before us. Let me illustrate the proposition.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDELSTEIN. I cannot yield. I only have 3 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. EDELSTEIN. I cannot yield. I only have 3 minutes.

On June 6 I wrote a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and I said:

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: I note that in the report filed on behalf of the committee to accompany H. R. 9766, the last paragraph therein reads as follows:

"Special evidence was produced before the committee in the hearing of a general bill in which the record of this alien was fully set forth. Such record was felt sufficient to justify the introduction of this bill."

I am desirous of acquainting myself with the evidence offered to support that conclusion, and, upon inquiry, find no printed report was made. Will you please be kind enough to direct the clerk of your committee to lend me a copy of the minutes of that hearing wherein testimony was taken with reference to the conclusion stated in the said report?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman let me answer the question? You want some evidence. I am going to give it to you.

Mr. EDELSTEIN. I do not yield. Ever since I sent that letter I have not been able to obtain a copy of the record. I have not been able to examine the record in order to determine for myself that the claim which is contained in the last paragraph of the report of the committee is justified by the contents of the hearings which they held. In other words, I have been asked to vote for a bill on the ground that there is evidence heard by the committee which justifies deportation from this country of a named individual, and yet I have not been able to see and examine that evidence for myself. Although I have made a persistent and continuous effort to obtain even for a short space of time a copy of the minutes from the office of the clerk of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, I have not been successful in doing so.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Does the gentleman want to see the report?

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. EDELSTEIN. As I have said, at no time could I obtain the evidence upon which the committee made its decision and without which I cannot conscientiously and honestly make my decision. Let us consider what is the acknowledged evidence with respect to the deportation of Bridges.

We all know that Mr. Bridges was arrested upon a warrant issued by the Department of Labor for his deportation on the ground that he was, or is, a member of, or affiliated with, an organization whose primary objective is the overthrow of our democratic form of government. I have no sympathy, nor is any Member of this House in sympathy, with anyone who would overthrow our form of government, or effect any

change in that form of government except in the constitutional way provided for making such changes. The hearings were conducted before a special trial examiner, James M. Landis, who is now dean of the Harvard Law School, and who before that was Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission and whose adherence to democracy and our constitutional form of government cannot be doubted by anybody. Mr. Landis conducted a long and careful hearing, at which both the Government and the alien were permitted to present their side of the matter in full detail.

At the end of that hearing Mr. Landis took the record, sat down with it, and prepared his decision based upon what had taken place at the hearing and what he found in the record. His careful and scholarly report I recommend to all of you as required reading in voting upon this bill. Mr. Landis came to the conclusion that he could not find Mr. Bridges to be a Communist or affiliated with the Communist Party. This conclusion he based upon the fact that the evidence offered by the Government, that is, the testimony of the Government's witnesses, on the whole, was unreliable, contradictory, and not worthy of belief. While he did not entirely agree with all the testimony offered on behalf of the alien, pointing out contradictory and weak points in the testimony offered on behalf of Bridges, he found that the Government had not proven its case; that Bridges had made out a strong case that he was not a Communist, but, rather, one whose philosophy of life was based upon democratic principles and whose only fault was, as far as the evidence before Mr. Landis showed, that he was a strong and active trade-union leader.

I have recited what took place before Mr. Landis not because I believe that Mr. Bridges is an angel or a paragon of all the virtues, but because there are people, of whom I am one, who are inclined to the belief that this effort to deport Mr. Bridges is based upon his active role as a trade-union leader rather than upon any connection which he may have with an organization which intends to overthrow our democratic form of government. If we deport Bridges, who is an active leader in one trade-union, there is no reason why we cannot deport an active trade-union leader of another organization, nor why we cannot deport all of them. If we can deport a trade-union leader, we can deport a person because we do not like the race from which he comes, or do not like the church in which he worships our Creator, or because we do not like the color of his hair; in fact, just because we do not like him.

From time to time in this country we are subject to waves of antialien hysteria. Any Member of this House who cares to consult the files of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Committee on Labor, can readily see the great number of bills against the employment of aliens and realize that we are again in the midst of such a period.

We must, of course, take necessary measures to defend our country, to prepare against attack from without and within, but that is no reason why we should throw away all judgment and attack everybody merely because a label has been pinned upon him. Such a procedure is un-American, undemocratic, and a terrible indictment of the way in which democratic processes function under strain.

If the committee which considered this bill received evidence which shows Bridges is a Communist or is affiliated in any way with the Communist Party the course of action is clear. Our immigration laws provide for the deportation of such individuals upon service of a warrant and upon a fair hearing. The committee states that in hearings upon a general bill it received sufficient evidence to justify the introduction of this special bill. I am reliably informed that although several of the members of the committee requested that Mr. Bridges be called to appear before the committee to answer such evidence that the majority of the committee objected to calling him. I do not think that such procedure is democratic or American. I do believe that it violates every tenet and every tradition of our system of justice. It might be possible perhaps that this evidence was so strong nothing Mr.

Bridges might say would overcome it. In that case certainly such evidence should have been made public. Even if it were that strong Mr. Bridges should have had an opportunity to appear before the committee to answer such evidence. An ex parte trial and ex parte condemnation is not the foundation upon which our country has prospered.

The evidence which the committee has should have been submitted to the Department of Labor for further action by it, for issuance of another warrant and another hearing. If the committee believes the evidence to be as strong as it claims then certainly the only result of the hearings on this warrant before the Department of Labor would be an order for his deportation. That is the American way.

There has not been cited one precedent in support of this special bill. Never before has Congress by special legislation singled out for deportation one individual or even a few individuals. Always it has provided a procedure for deportation of undesirable classes of aliens, specifying the conditions which determine undesirability. Always undesirability has been determined by a quasi-judicial hearing held by the Department of Labor. At such hearings the alien was given a full opportunity to present his defense against the charges leveled at him. Today, for the first time in our history, we propose to deport one individual without conforming to traditional procedure and without giving him an opportunity to be heard in his own defense.

More than any other Member in this House, I stand to gain from the deportation of aliens who are members of or affiliated with the Communist Party. My record and my stand with respect to communism are clear. I was elected a Member of this House at a special election held on February 6 of this year. Unlike my Republican opponent, I openly declared my hostility toward communism and successfully defeated the Communist candidate, Earl Browder, by an overwhelming majority. While the deportation of alien Communists would improve my political position, what I have to consider here, however, is not what is the easy way for me, which is to vote with the majority, but what is the proper way for me to act on this bill even though it be not the way of the majority.

If it were consonant with American principles, American traditions, American democracy, to deport a single individual upon ex parte accusations, I would, of course, vote for this bill, but that is not my conception, or the conception of most people in this country, of democracy. We must remember that this same charge was made against Bridges and that upon a fair and full hearing the charge was not sustained. I cannot hold my self-respect and assert hereafter that I believe in the American way, in our constitutional form of government and the principles which underlie our democracy if I cast my vote for the passage of this bill. I trust that a majority of this House will not support this bill, because there is no evidence to justify its adoption, because it constitutes the establishment of a vicious precedent in these troublesome days, and because it clearly is a violation and contradiction of our democratic way. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY].

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill (H. R. 9766) because I think it proposes to do something which is fundamentally wrong. This bill of five lines contains enough political dynamite to blast into dust the constitutional and legislative pillars which are the foundation stones of our democratic system of government. In brief, this bill directs the Attorney General "notwithstanding any other provision of law" to deport an individual named therein. Such a mandate would be an historical departure from our American tradition. This is the first time in the history of our Government that an act of Congress has singled out a named individual for deportation. Since the passage of the Alien and Sedition laws, a century and a half ago, it is the only bill that has provided for a deportation without a hearing or without giving the accused what our Nation has long known as "due process of law."

Mr. Chairman, the man at whom this bill is directed was lawfully admitted to this country, but it is now charged that he is here in violation of the law. After a lengthy hearing, and the taking of over 7,000 pages of testimony, it was the opinion of Mr. James Landis, dean of the Harvard Law School, who presided at the hearings, that the accused man should not be deported. The Secretary of Labor approved the findings of the trial commissioner. This bill would reverse the action of the Secretary of Labor.

The precedent that would be established by the passage of this bill would be detrimental to the general welfare of every citizen. As an American, I will not, for the sake of my own liberty, deny the protection of uniform and indiscriminatory laws, and of fair hearings to any other person. For the sake of argument, I am willing to concede that the person named in this bill is an undesirable person and should be deported. However, in our desire to deport one man, do not let us do violence to a precious heritage—the Bill of Rights! The sound timbers with which the Ship of State was built were shrewdly and wisely selected—by thinkers, idealists, soldiers, and philosophers. In its structure there is a plank that guarantees every person equal rights before the law. Our forefathers objected to a Government where "whatever pleased the prince had the force of law". There can be no doubt that the framers of our Constitution were determined that every man should have his day in court. If this bill passes, we shall, in my opinion, be striking a deadly blow at that sacred right.

I think that the pending bill goes so perilously near to being a bill of attainder as to be almost indistinguishable from one. I believe that it could be regarded as an *ex post facto* law. The Constitution of the United States says: "No bill of attainder or *ex post facto* law shall be passed (art. 1, sec. 9).

Ex post facto, arising or enacted after the fact; retrospective; retroactive, *ex post facto* law, any law which contemplates the penalizing in any degree of any act or of the omission of an act, which acts and omissions were respectively permissible and not punishable before its passage. Such laws are declared to be unconstitutional by article 1, section 9, paragraph 3, of the United States Constitution, nor can they be made virtually effective by giving them a civil form; in England, however, Parliament is not enjoined from passing such laws.

During this debate I have heard the proponents as well as the opponents cite the same authority for their position. It is found in *Cummings against Missouri*.

A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. "Bills of this sort," says Mr. Justice Story, "have been most usually passed in England in times of rebellion, or of gross subversy to the Crown, or of violent political excitements, periods in which all nations are most liable, as well the free as enslaved, to forget their duties and to trample upon the rights and liberties of others." These bills are generally directed against individuals by name, but they may be directed against a whole class. *Cummings v. Missouri* 71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277, 323, 18 L. ed. 356).

Mr. Chairman, there is an unbroken line of authorities supporting the *Cummings* case. *Cummings* against Missouri held unconstitutional an act passed by the legislature of Missouri that denied, not to an individual, but to a class, ministers of the gospel, the right to preach the gospel unless they took an oath that they had not been affiliated with the Confederacy during the period of the Civil War. A Catholic priest saw fit to violate the law in Missouri. He was arrested. His name was Cummings. The case went to the Supreme Court on the issue that the law was in the nature of a bill of attainder. It was held to be a bill of attainder and in violation of section 9, article I of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, without doubt this bill is unconstitutional because it is a denial of "due process" under the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

At this time, I wish to reply to a statement that has been repeatedly made here this afternoon to the effect that an alien has no rights. An alien resident in this country, if he was lawfully admitted, has every right of judicial trial, every protection, and every safeguard that the Constitution gives to any human being.

It is well at this very moment, when passion and prejudice run so high, to be ever mindful of the rich and wholesome restraining influence of our Constitution. Even the meanest, lowliest human being must not be denied the rights secured by that sacred document, which has carried us through our entire national existence and is now the beacon light of hope to a weary, unhappy, and suffering world.

Since the beginning of my legislative career as a State Senator in 1924, right down to the present day, I have opposed and voted against class legislation of every kind. My vote today, on this bill, will be in keeping with that perfect record.

My parents were born in Ireland and, through them, I met many immigrants from Ireland as well as from other foreign countries. In my experience, most of these aliens made good neighbors and became loyal citizens. I deplore the sinister attacks that are constantly being made by certain groups in this country against alien residents because of their race, or their creed, or their color. As a Member of Congress, I shall continue to fight against any attempt to discriminate or penalize a person because of his religious or his political views.

I wish the vote on this measure could be postponed until next week in order to allow every member sufficient time to analyze the bill and contemplate the irreparable damage to one's constitutional rights that will inevitably result from such a law.

By voting for this bill, in a moment of legislative wrath, we would repudiate forever a priceless legacy—equality before the law—no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. By voting against this bill we shall retain that legacy and the blessings of a free country.

In order to obtain the rights we now enjoy under our Constitution, our forefathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Can we do less for our children?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this is an unusual procedure, but it has been made necessary because of the unusual conduct of the officials of the Federal Government in failing and refusing to deport undesirable aliens. [Applause.]

No one here has stated that Harry Bridges is a desirable person to live within the United States. The Congress has the power to pass whatever legislation it desires or feels necessary to protect the best interests of the country; hence this bill before us today. Those who criticize the procedure may be honest and sincere, but they have voted time and time again for private bills amending basic law in order to keep aliens in the United States. Oftentimes they have voted for private bills to permit aliens to remain in this country who entered unlawfully and who had been convicted of crime. Now, however, when it becomes necessary to pass a private bill, or a bill of this character, in order to get rid of an undesirable alien, these same people rise in great horror and cry out on the floor of the House, "Undemocratic! Un-American"! [Applause.]

There has been sufficient evidence adduced before congressional committees—more than one of them—to the effect that Harry Bridges has associated with and has cooperated with Communists; and there is very strong evidence in the records of congressional committees given under oath by responsible and reliable witnesses to the effect he is a Communist and that he has been sympathetic with their program. No one can point to a single good thing he has done which would entitle him to the reward of being allowed to continue to live in this country. He has done more to disturb the peace and the security of certain sections of our country than any alien we have ever had. He has done more to destroy the merchant marine of this sovereign Government of ours than the Confederate States did during the war between the States; yet there are those who would like to keep him

in the United States. I cannot understand the spirit or psychology motivating those who want to keep him here. It is ridiculous to assert the United States does not have the power to protect itself by deporting undesirable aliens.

It may be true that Dean Landis is a learned lawyer. It may be true that his students have a great regard for him, but I venture the assertion here and now there is not a Member of this House who thought Dean Landis would hold other than he did in the Bridges case in order to take the heat off of somebody else. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] is to be commended for his untiring efforts to give us protection from undesirable aliens. He has been a leader in the fight for selective and restrictive immigration. In his fight to preserve America for decent, law-abiding, and God-fearing people he is deserving of our praise and support. [Applause.]

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Chairman, I voted in the affirmative on the rule. I intend to vote in the negative on the passage of this bill if it remains in the condition it now is. If it is amended so as to come within what in my humble judgment is constitutional, I shall gladly vote for it.

I am not going to find fault with any of my colleagues who differ with me in their conclusions, and I want to say that it would be the easier way for me in the congressional district that I represent, being far removed from the coast and having virtually no C. I. O. labor in it, to vote as the great majority evidently will vote from the expressions we have heard; but I cannot in good conscience, consistent with my oath as a Member of this House, likewise as a member of the bar of the State of Washington, of the Supreme Court of the United States, and also as a judge of a court of general jurisdiction for 10 years before coming here, bring myself to the belief that this legislation is constitutional, much as I might feel that Mr. Bridges should not be here. Feeling this way, it is my plain duty to vote against it if it remains as it is now written.

It is unconstitutional, in my judgment, upon two grounds: First, it is a bill of attainder, which Congress is prohibited from enacting.

I shall cite the same authority cited by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], to wit, Cummings against Missouri:

A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. "Bills of this sort," says Mr. Justice Story, "have been most usually passed in England in times of rebellion, or of gross subversivity to the Crown, or of violent political excitements, periods in which all nations are most liable, as well the free as enslaved, to forget their duties and to trample upon the rights and liberties of others." These bills are generally directed against individuals by name, but they may be directed against a whole class. (*Cummings v. Missouri*, 71 U. S. (4 Wall.), 277, 323, 18 L. ed. 356.)

It is well at this very moment, when passion and prejudice run so high, to ever be mindful of the rich and wholesome restraining influences of our Constitution. Even the meanest, lowliest human being must not be denied the rights secured by that sacred document, which has carried us through our entire national existence and is now the beacon light of hope to a weary, unhappy, and suffering world.

Mr. Chairman, there is an unbroken line of authorities supporting the Cummings case. Cummings against Missouri held unconstitutional an act passed by the legislature of Missouri that denied, not to an individual, but to a class, ministers of the gospel, the right to preach the gospel unless they took an oath that they had not been affiliated with the Confederacy during the period of the Civil War. A Catholic priest saw fit to violate the law in Missouri. He was arrested. His name was Cummings. The case went to the Supreme Court on the issue that the law was in the nature of a bill of attainder. It was held to be a bill of attainder and in violation of section 9, article I of the Federal Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is unconstitutional also because it is a denial of due process under the fifth amendment to the Constitution and I want to take the argument that is so re-

peatedly made here this afternoon that an alien has no rights. An alien resident in this country, if he lawfully came in here, has every right of judicial trial, every protection, and every safeguard that the Constitution gives to any human being if he lawfully came in. If he unlawfully came in then he has not acquired rights and if you will follow the authorities, and there is a wealth of material on this, you will find that no alien nonresident has the right to say that he could come to America. The Congress alone fixes that. It is a privilege extended or withheld, but when once extended and he comes to the country, that privilege ripens into a right and no person can be denied or deprived of his rights without due process of law and that irrespective of citizenship. We have set up a quasi-judicial tribunal to try anyone not a citizen charged with being here unlawfully. We go even further than that. We say to that individual, "The burden is upon you to show cause why you should not be deported." But when we seek to deny him the right to any form of hearing we deny him the right of due process as defined in the fifth amendment to the Constitution. I am frank to say that the seven-page letter read here today written by Mr. Bridges in his own defense did not convince me that he carried the burden, but that does not mean that I will violate my oath to uphold the Constitution as I see it and support this legislation to meet the popular clamor of the moment.

In my humble judgment, Mr. Chairman, it would be a serious mistake to pass legislation of this kind. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this bill. I believe Harry Bridges and all of his kind should be deported. He is a troublemaker of the first order and America is not the place and now is not the time for troublemakers.

In answer to the argument advanced by the distinguished gentleman who just preceded me on this floor, may I say that I believe this bill is constitutional. Much has been said concerning a bill of attainder, but I remind you that this is not an action that inflicts punishment for a crime. It is an act by the legislative body against a single individual, but deportation is not punishment for a crime. Deportation is a civil proceeding, not a criminal prosecution.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. Is it not a fact that an alien cannot even appeal a deportation order?

Mr. CURTIS. That is right.

Mr. DIES. Whether there is any evidence to sustain it or not, he has no right of appeal?

Mr. CURTIS. That is right. The prohibition in the constitution of ex post facto laws and bills of attainder refers to criminal proceedings and not to civil proceedings. As has been said, deportation is not punishment for a crime, but a civil proceeding.

This bill comes here with almost the unanimous support of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. The distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD], presented this matter to the committee in a general bill and as a result of his able presentation of the facts, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN], introduced this bill before the Congress.

Mr. Oppenheim in his work on international law, says:

Just as a state is competent to refuse admission to an alien, so, in conformity with its territorial supremacy, it is competent to expel at any moment an alien who has been admitted into its territory.

It is an accepted maxim of international law that every sovereign nation has the power, as inherent in sovereignty, and essential to self-preservation, to forbid the entrance of foreigners within its dominion, or to admit them only in such cases and upon such conditions as it may see fit to prescribe.

That statement was made by the Supreme Court of the United States in a case involving the constitutionality of the Immigration Act of March 3, 1891.

The absolute right of control over immigration by a nation is essential to the preservation of its national existence.

The expulsion of aliens is necessarily embraced in the power to regulate their admission and exclusion.

Mr. DIES. Is there any difference in principle between this bill and the many private bills that have been introduced by the Immigration Committee and supported by many of these gentlemen who are now opposing this bill? We have had many bills where aliens were mandatorily admitted. The Congress said notwithstanding the law and notwithstanding the fact you made other aliens leave the country under like conditions, yet we, the Congress, withhold deportation of the alien. What is the difference in principle?

Mr. CURTIS. There is no difference in principle and in fact it is an established rule where authority to do a certain act the authority to do the contrary is implied. We have court decision after court decision that says that if a certain official has power to appoint subordinates, he likewise has the power to discharge, and it follows that if we have the authority to disregard the general law and admit an individual alien, we have the right to expel an individual alien.

Charles Hyde, in his work on international law declares that a—

State may doubtless decide for itself whether the continued presence within its territory of a particular alien is so adverse to the national interests that the country needs to rid itself of him. If such be its decision, the right of expulsion must be acknowledged. A conclusion in favor of expulsion need not necessarily coincide with one to which the state of which the alien is a national would, under like circumstances, assent.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN], the author of this bill, and for the members of the committee who have seen fit to report it favorably. I have the highest regard for the membership of this House, which has just now almost unanimously voted the adoption of the rule for its consideration.

I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], and I wish to take his opening remarks as the text of mine. He said, and I am sure that he would not have so stated unless he had ascertained that the statement was true, that this is the first time in the history of our Government that a bill aimed at one man has been brought before Congress.

Mr. Chairman, without any passion, without any prejudice whatsoever, heartily favoring the deportation of Harry Bridges, loving everyone in this House, I must call your attention, if I am to be honest with myself, to the fact that this is supposed to be a Government "of laws and not of men"; that bills of attainder, ex post facto laws and the like, are outlawed by our Constitution; that the legislative branch of our Government should not usurp the prerogative of our judicial or administrative tribunals, if we would preserve our historic, constitutional doctrine of separation of powers. Yet today, for the first time in our history, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is correct, we have a bill before us aimed exclusively at one, named, man.

It is so perilously near being a bill of attainder as to be almost indistinguishable from one. It is almost, if not quite, an ex post facto law. The Constitution of the United States says:

No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed. (Art. I, sec. 9.)

I happen to have been the chairman of a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, charged with the duty of making the investigation under the resolution for the impeachment of the Secretary of Labor, the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, and the Solicitor of Labor. In that investigation we read every word of the evidence in the files of the Labor Department, and the report of the Dies committee, against Harry Bridges. I doubt if anything could be said in condemnation of Harry Bridges which I would question. Not only do I have a fixed conviction that he should be deported, but I have tried as-

siduously to accomplish that desirable end by drawing and assisting in drawing legislation under which he could not escape deportation. This House passed one of the bills to which I refer in May 1939, when we passed the Smith bill, H. R. 5138, with only 48 dissenting votes. I sincerely hope and pray that it will be passed by the Senate and become a law at this session of Congress.

I cannot quarrel with anyone for supporting the bill before us now, but I simply cannot go along. [Applause.]

None of my reasons is based on technicality. It would be unworthy of this occasion, a crisis in the legislative history of our Nation, to deal in technicalities, or fine-spun theories. I favor, strongly, the end. I deplore, strongly, the proposed means. I could not bring myself to take this position unless my reasons were, in my opinion, well grounded and impelling. Here, we are face to face with a challenge to do a legislative job in a workmanlike manner. We all wish that job done. Yet, by this bill we confess our inadequacy—we admit that we cannot draw a bill which will do that job in accordance with the time-honored landmarks of our profession. With the best of motives, this bill frankly transgresses one of the cardinal principles which our founding forefathers would have died to preserve inviolate. Rarely, if ever, since the Barons of Runnymede wrung Magna Carta from the unwilling hand of King John, has any such piece of legislation been seriously considered.

Even the alien and sedition laws, of odious memory, did not name the objects of the then legislative wrath.

Is the bill under consideration (H. R. 9766) a bill of attainder?

A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. "Bills of this sort," says Mr. Justice Story, "have been most usually passed in England in times of rebellion, or of gross subservience to the Crown, or of violent political excitements, periods in which all nations are most liable, as well the free as enslaved, to forget their duties and to trample upon the rights and liberties of others." These bills are generally directed against individuals by name, but they may be directed against a whole class. (*Cummings v. Missouri*, 71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277, 323, 18 L. Ed. 356.)

The term "bill of attainder," within the meaning of the Federal Constitution, included a general statute passed after the Civil War, which required all attorneys at law to take an oath that they had never voluntarily borne arms against the United States, or given aid, countenance, counsel, or encouragement to persons engaged in armed hostilities thereto, as a condition to their right to practice in the Supreme Court of the United States. In this leading case the majority opinion was written by Justice Field, and was based to a large extent upon a prior decision in the same term of *Cummings v. State of Missouri* (4 Wall. 277), in which the statute of Missouri, requiring ministers of the gospel to take a similar oath as a condition to their right to exercise the privileges of their profession, was held unconstitutional. Mr. Justice Miller, on behalf of himself, the Chief Justice, and Justices Swayne and Davis, delivered a dissenting opinion in *Ex parte Garland*, which is expressly made applicable not only to that case but to the case of *Cummings v. State of Missouri*, in which he says "the word 'attainder' is derived by Sir Thomas Tomlins, in his law dictionary, from the words 'attincta' and 'attinctura,' and is defined to be 'the stain or corruption of the blood of a criminal capitally condemned; the immediate inseparable consequence of the common law on the pronouncing the sentence of death.' The effect of this corruption of the blood was that the party attainted lost all inheritable quality, and could neither receive nor transmit any property or other rights by inheritance. Upon an attentive examination of the distinctive features of this kind of legislation, I think it will be found that the following comprise those essential elements of bills of attainder, in addition to the one already mentioned, which distinguish them from other legislation, and which made them so obnoxious to the statesmen who organized our Government: (1) They were convictions and sentences pronounced by the legislative department of the Government instead of the judicial. (2) The sentence pronounced and the punishment inflicted were determined by no previous law or fixed rule. (3) The investigation into the guilt of the accused, if any such were made, was not necessarily or generally conducted in his presence or that of his counsel, and no recognized rule of evidence governed the inquiry." The conclusion of the majority of the Court was denied by the dissenting judges on the ground that the laws in question did not contain the essential requirements, in the definition of "bill of attainder," of working a corruption of blood, or in describing any person or class of persons by name or description. (*Ex parte Garland*, 71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 333, 387, 18 L. Ed. 366.)

A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. If the punishment be less than death, it is a bill of pains and penalties. As the term "bill of attainder" is used in the Federal Constitution, it includes both bills of attainder particularly, and bills of pains and penalties. (*Cummings*

v. Missouri, (71 U. S. (4 Wall.) 277, 18 L. Ed. 356); *Drehman v. Stifle* (75 U. S. (8 Wall.), 595, 601, 19 L. Ed. 508); *Pierce v. Carskadon*, 83 U. S. (16 Wall.) 234, 239, 21 L. Ed. 276.)

Quoting further from the dissenting opinion in *ex parte Garland*:

It is no cause for wonder that men who had just passed successfully through a desperate struggle in behalf of civil liberty should feel a detestation for legislation of which these were the prominent features. The framers of our political system had a full appreciation of the necessity of keeping separate and distinct the primary departments of the Government. Mr. Hamilton, in the seventy-eighth number of the *Federalist*, says that he agrees with the maxim of Montesquieu, that "There is no liberty if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive powers."

And others of the ablest numbers of that publication are devoted to the purpose of showing that in our Constitution these powers are so justly balanced and restrained that neither will probably be able to make much encroachment upon the others. Nor was it less repugnant to their views of the security of personal rights, that any person should be condemned without a hearing, and punished without a law previously prescribing the nature and extent of that punishment. They therefore struck boldly at all this machinery of legislative despotism, by forbidding the passage of bills of attainder and *ex post facto* laws, both to Congress and to the States.

The dissenting opinion in the *Garland* case attempts to justify its contention by saying that the act of Congress there in question did not contain the name or any designation of a person or persons, and that the barring of attorneys from the practice of their profession who had not taken a prescribed oath, was not a punishment for a criminal offense. But the prevailing opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States swept aside these contentions and held the act to be unconstitutional and void; saying:

The statute is directed against parties who have offended in any of the particulars embraced by these clauses. And its object is to exclude them from the profession of the law, or at least from its practice in the courts of the United States. As the oath prescribed cannot be taken by these parties, the act, as against them, operates as a legislative decree of perpetual exclusion. And exclusion from any of the professions or any of the ordinary avocations of life for past conduct can be regarded in no other light than as punishment for such conduct. The exaction of the oath is the mode provided for ascertaining the parties upon whom the act is intended to operate, and instead of lessening, increases its objectionable character. All enactments of this kind partake of the nature of bills of pains and penalties, and are subject to the constitutional inhibition against the passage of bills of attainder, under which general designation they are included.

But wholly aside from the question whether or not the pending bill is unconstitutional because a bill of attainder or a bill of pains and penalties or because it is an *ex post facto* law, please permit me most earnestly to call your attention to the following considerations:

First. In this bill Harry Bridges is not charged with any deportable offense, nor with any offense at all. Far from being denied, this fact is asserted with evident satisfaction in the report accompanying the bill. See Report No. 2200.

Second. The motivating predicate of this bill, as set out on page 2 of the report, is as follows:

Bridges is regarded by the framers of this bill as a menace to the interests of this country. His close association with known Communists was brought out and admitted by him in the Government's warrant hearing in his deportation case during the summer of 1939.

Thus do we revert to the days of the original alien and sedition laws, which constituted so sad a chapter in the history of the American Congress. But now it is boldly admitted in this report that what was then declared unconstitutional when asserted by mere innuendo has become a legislative virtue. This frankness is commendable. It does not, however, change the fact that this bill would order the deportation of Harry Bridges without charging any offense whatsoever save that he is regarded by the framers of this bill as a menace to the interests of this country.

Third. This bill denied Bridges the right to any hearing whatsoever, although even an alien, as has been repeatedly held by the Supreme Court of the United States, is entitled to due process of law under the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Fourth. This bill utterly ignores our traditional doctrine of the separation of the powers of government among the three

independent, coordinate branches of our Government—legislative, executive, and judicial. It is a flagrant attempt to have the legislative branch usurp the judicial prerogative hitherto exercised exclusively by administrative or judicial tribunals.

Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report; if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.

In my opinion, Harry Bridges is a menace to the interests of this country, just as the framers of the pending bill regard him. He should be deported. But I maintain that he should be deported by due process of law. His banishment should be decreed for cause, ascertained by legally constituted tribunals—not by legislative usurpation.

He should be deported for what he is: an alien termite seeking to destroy our Government. He should not be magnified by being dealt with in a special, personal bill, even if it were constitutional. But we should not destroy the house of our government of laws to rid the house of one termite.

Lynching is frequently defined as the taking of the law into unauthorized hands. In the light of this definition, may not the passage of this bill be called lynching? [Applause.]

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been fixed by the House, and the Committee of the Whole cannot extend the time.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I was too late in securing time, therefore I cannot discuss the constitutional phase of this bill.

I voted for the rule. I usually vote for a rule to bring a bill before the House for consideration. But having practiced law since 1904, having served upon the bench, and having appeared before the various courts of this country, I cannot this afternoon, regardless of what the sentiment is here, support a bill such as this containing the provisions it does. We are dealing with something bigger than a man; we are dealing with the fundamental principles of this country. We are dealing with the laws and with the Constitution of this country. Bridges may come and Bridges may go, but it is our hope that the Constitution of the United States will go on forever. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, certainly I see no reason why the membership of this House should get excited about this matter. I realize, as you do, that it is important, but after all has been said on this measure, each of us can vote as we feel about it. We may use our own reason for voting for or against it.

Mr. Bridges, according to his statement, came to the United States 20 years ago last April. He has never become a citizen of the United States. He has never availed himself of the right to appear before any one of our courts for a hearing, as provided by law, asking that he be granted the rights of citizenship. And yet he has been here for 20 years. He said in his statement, that was read by the distinguished member from New York, that in 1921 he filed his declaration to become a citizen of the United States. That he permitted the period of 7 years, as provided by law, to elapse before he thought of filing his petition for a hearing before a court to ask for the granting of a certificate of citizenship. Just a little strange that a man who could read and understand the English language, and who claims to be interested in the affairs of Government, would neglect so important a matter. The cost of a certificate of arrival is \$2.50 and the cost of filing the petition is \$5.

Furthermore, according to his statement, he almost immediately after his declaration of intention had expired, filed a new declaration, for which he paid the sum of \$2.50. Then he says in the statement that we have before us this after-

noon he did not file the petition for final papers because of lack of funds. This expense would have been, as I have said before, \$2.50 for certificate of arrival and \$5 for filing the petition for citizenship and the right to go before the court to ask that he be granted the rights of citizenship. Of course, if his witnesses who were to testify as to his good character and their general knowledge of him would charge him for that service, such expense would be additional.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us be fair about some of these things. What did he do about that declaration that he procured in 1928? He let it lapse; that is what he did. He let it go past the 7-year period and did not during that 7 years even attempt to complete his citizenship. Then what does the record show? In 1935 or 1936, for the third time, he paid the fee of \$2.50, and again, and for the third time, filed his declaration to become a citizen of the United States. So far as the record discloses, he has not appeared before a court to ask for a hearing on the granting of final citizenship. Now, I know that this does not condemn him. He does not have to try to complete his rights of citizenship unless he wants to do so. As I said before, here is a man who claims that he is particularly interested in the affairs of this Government. He even says that he wants to help this Government to get rid of certain persons who are obnoxious to the Government of this country. It just seems strange that a man who claims leadership of a great body of American citizens could have proved his sincerity to his attachment to the principles of our Government by attempting to complete his right to become a citizen. Now, Mr. Chairman, he has answered that question rather plainly. We have his statement. It is not the statement of the Member from New York. It is the statement of the man in question. He says that if he should have attempted to complete his citizenship, the courts would not be fair to him. Read his own statement in the Record tomorrow. He criticizes the courts before whom he has not even requested a hearing on this question.

Mr. Chairman, something had been said about the Landis report. This report has been made a part of the report of this committee. As I understand it, the question there turned principally on a technicality as to whether or not there was sufficient proof to show that he was "affiliated" with certain organizations. You have that report before you.

Not only that, Mr. Chairman, you have a statement of the man who is the subject matter of this bill before you. His statement, consisting of several typewritten pages, has been read to you by a Member of this body. Not to a committee, but by unanimous consent of this membership, the Congressman of New York was granted the privilege of taking the time to place the entire statement before us. I am very glad, indeed, that it was done.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not inflict punishment on anyone. It does not put anyone in jail or in the penitentiary. It does not relieve him of any of his property. It does not attempt to cancel the citizenship of anyone. It simply says, in substance, that, so far as the Government of the United States is concerned, that this alien has so conducted and demeaned himself that his further presence in this country is undesirable. That during the 20 years he has been a guest of this country his conduct and demeanor are such that he should be invited to return to his native country of Australia, if that is the place from whence he came.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that the situations that I am about to mention may not quite fit into each other, but a good deal has been said about the right of Congress to deport an alien in this manner. But there are Members of this body who are opposed to this measure, who have private bills pending before the Committee on Immigration, asking that certain individual aliens be permitted to remain in the United States, the application of the law notwithstanding. A number of these bills, for various reasons, have merit. As a matter of fact, this Congress has approved many such bills during this and other sessions. Many have been passed by unanimous consent and without debate.

One thing more, Mr. Chairman; the gentleman from New York quoted Mr. Bridges as saying that he was offered \$50,000

if he would resign his leadership of a certain group and join a group or organization who offered the \$50,000. That is a pretty strong indictment. I think that if the gentleman really wanted to be really fair, if he is the kind of a person he claims for himself, then in view of this much of his statement he should disclose the name of the person or persons who made the offer and should furnish such further information on this matter as would be of interest to this Government. I believe it is his duty to do it. As a matter of fact, if he wants to be open and aboveboard, he should provide the information or explain why it should not be done. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Labor be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to take into custody and deport to Australia, the country of which he is a citizen or subject, the alien, Harry Renton Bridges, in the manner provided by sections 155 and 156, title 8, United States Code.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. LESINSKI: Mr. LESINSKI moves to amend the title by striking out the word "authorize" and inserting the word "direct."

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, in explanation to the House, the committee wants it mandatory that Harry Bridges be deported.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to take into custody forthwith and deport forthwith to Australia, the country of which he is a citizen or subject, the alien, Harry Renton Bridges, whose presence in this country the Congress deems hurtful."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to prevent any attempt to find a loophole, through a technicality of any description, which would tend to prohibit or prevent the Attorney General of the United States or any individual from evading the intent and purpose of this bill which is a mandate by the Congress of the United States to deport this undesirable alien, Harry Renton Bridges.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. What would happen if Bridges were arrested according to the direction of Congress and Australia refused to accept him?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That becomes a problem for the Department of Justice.

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman will yield further, I think I can give him some information.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand the situation, if an alien is ordered deported and arrested and the country of his origin or where he belongs refuses to accept him, he is then in custody in the United States. We have had a number of similar cases, as I understand. Russia will not receive a Communist who is ordered deported. Therefore he is in the custody of the United States, and the practice, as I understand it, has been to release him on his own recognizance. The Hobbs bill was introduced here and passed the House in an effort to remedy that situation, but it has not been remedied.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In reply to the gentleman from Michigan, according to information furnished by the Department of Labor, the United States has encountered no difficulty with the British Government or her possessions about the return of aliens.

Mr. MICHENER. I think that is correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. We should not encounter any difficulty in the return of Mr. Bridges since the Department of Justice will be compelled to comply with such a mandate of Congress.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER].

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The British Government, of which Harry Renton Bridges is a subject, can use him to good advantage in the fighting lines and we will at the same time be removing him from the guerrilla bushwhacking lines where he is trying to destroy our country's national defense through disruption of the merchant marine of our country.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Does not the latter part of this amendment bring this bill in line with the decisions and statements of our own Supreme Court?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Has the gentleman given any consideration to the fact that if his amendment is carried out to its utmost that he even deprives Mr. Bridges of an opportunity to sue in the courts for a writ of habeas corpus?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. An alien who is here for the purpose of destroying our form of government is not entitled to the protection of our courts and has the gall to expect such consideration.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Has no right to a writ of habeas corpus?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Not under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. GWYNNE. Is it not a fact that the court has already said that the Congress may deport a person and that he has no right to a trial in the courts?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. GWYNNE. That is the decision of the court?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question as to the last part of that amendment which, as I understand it, states that the Congress deems his presence to be hurtful? I am wondering about the advisability of that language, and will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. That phrase was included in the bill to bring it in line with the Supreme Court decision which uses that specific language.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does not that put the Congress in the position of sitting in judicial review and forming conclusions?

Mr. MASON. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to the gentleman from Washington that that decision was written by Mr. Justice Holmes in 1913, and a similar one by Mr. Justice Brandeis in 1922.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES].

Mr. BOLLES. This action is supported by the Supreme Court in two decisions, one of *Mahler v. Eby*, (264 U. S. 32 (1924)), and *Bugajewitz v. Adams* (228 U. S. 585 (1913)), where it was held that the right to expel aliens is a sovereign power, and the fact of prior conviction, even under laws since repealed—the espionage and selective draft acts—may be made the basis for classification as an undesirable subject to deportation.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In offering this amendment, I want to take the privilege of calling the attention of the House to the fact that this action is nonpartisan, since Democrats and Republicans support this urgent legislation.

My colleague the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable A. LEONARD ALLEN, is a comember of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and is the author of this bill. He is to be warmly commended by Democrats and Republicans alike for his staunch Americanism.

The intent of the Allen bill is without doubt one of the greatest contributions that an American can make in these

trying days to the welfare of our country. This bill brings to the attention of the House that a democracy can function irrespective of any dilatory tactics on the part of high officials of the Government.

The people of Louisiana may point with pardonable pride to the courage, loyalty, love, and devotion to America that their Representative, the gentleman from Louisiana, A. LEONARD ALLEN, has so ably demonstrated in introducing this timely and patriotic measure. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am saddened and disappointed to think that with but an hour's debate we should contemplate passing such a far-reaching bill as this, particularly at a time like this. It has been said on this floor that more is at stake in this resolution than the deportation of Harry Bridges. With that I agree. I think there is a great deal at stake. I do not think it is necessary to preface my remarks by saying I am opposed to Communists and communism and to Nazis and nazi-ism. I do not question the desirability of deporting Harry Bridges. From all that I have heard, from all that I have read, I believe that he is an undesirable alien; but if our laws are not adequate to protect us from undesirable aliens then it is certainly the duty of this Congress to stay in session and enact such legislation as will give us the protection that we are entitled to, and we should not be asked to pass on bills of this kind with an hour's debate. I am not a lawyer. I cannot discuss the constitutional question involved, and I am inclined to be glad sometime that that ambition was never realized. It has been said that it is not punishment to deport an alien. Perhaps, legally, it is not; but if I happened to be an alien and I had a wife and two children here, and I was ordered deported, I would think that I was being punished by somebody.

The substitute, or amendment, that we are asked to pass now even deprives this alien of whatever rights he may have had under our laws, such as the right to a writ of habeas corpus. It deprives him of any rights that he may have under the Constitution.

If this bill is passed, I fear that we will have an epidemic of bills to deport this man or that man, this woman or that woman, and I fear, perhaps in a spirit of hysteria that may manifest itself if world conditions stay as they are, that some Member may even rise in the Well of this House and propose to deport his alien mother-in-law, or even suggest the deportation of aliens who happen to have red hair, if that color happens to become unpopular during the present war. The only evidence we have before us is in the report of the committee reporting out this bill that in the opinion of the sponsors Harry Bridges is a menace to the institutions of this country, and that he has had close association with known Communists. That is all the evidence we have. If a man can be deported without a hearing, without a trial, without the right of appeal because he has associated with Communists, and because the framer of a bill, regardless of whom he may be, thinks that he is a menace, then the Bill of Rights, the Constitution and all civil liberties have gone out of the window. I hope in the few minutes that now remain before we vote on this bill that we will consider its far-reaching effect and govern ourselves accordingly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The bill is distinctly unconstitutional, and now by suspending the operation of the writ of habeas corpus, it is making the bill doubly unconstitutional.

Mr. MILLER. I leave that for the attorneys in the House to decide.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. If we pass this bill this afternoon—and I have no word in defense of this man, I would not know him if I saw him—the precedent that we will establish will plague every Congress as long as there is a Congress held under the Constitution of the United States. This is a time when we must keep our feet on the ground. This bill as originally drawn

might give a man a chance for a trial, because it says that he would be deported in the manner provided by sections 155 and 156 of the United States Code. As a matter of fact, the bill would really be ineffective as of itself to deport him.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. In a moment. The bill provided as originally drawn for deporting him in accordance with the provisions of those sections. Those provisions give the man a right to be tried, and find out whether or not he is guilty of the things that would cause him to be deported. Everything was a question of fact there. Section 156 provided for the contingency which is met by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] when he asked, Supposing Australia refuses to accept him? Section 156 would meet that, but that has been eliminated. If Australia does not accept him, you can keep him here in jail until he rots, by the amendment now proposed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. He needs to rot.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is not the question. We are dealing more with law than a man. It is not necessary for me to tell you that this is a government not of men, but a government of law, unless we have lost our heads and senses. Such legislation leads to a breaking down of the fundamental principles that the founders of our Constitution gave us. I fully realize that the word "alien" today seems of itself to bring to the surface emotions that tend to override our deliberate judgment. This should not be the case unless we are descendants of Indians as we are all descendants of, at one time, aliens. I do not believe we should be squeamish about the word "alien." Aliens have the same Constitutional rights and the same rights to due process of law as have citizens. It might be of interest to read United States Code of 1934, title 18, article 52.

We still have a government by law. I have gone through some of this in 1917. Yes, Mr. Chairman, among other things I have seen mobs take a man out on the street and make him kiss the flag or else be hanged. For what? Because he used more bread than the local committee thought he ought to have used. Those are the things that will live to plague us in the future.

We have got something at stake here today much bigger than Harry Bridges. Of course, I will agree with my friend; I think he ought to rot. The gentleman is right. But that is not the case. Do you want your Constitution to become punctured with holes like this, by reason of which it will gradually be broken down? My friends, this is a serious problem. I would not know Bridges if I met him in the road, branded, but I do know something about our Constitution. I do know that our Constitution and laws rise above men. This man will be gone in years to come; perhaps shortly. People will forget him. But the precedent we are establishing this afternoon will rise up to plague us in the future. It will plague the Congress in the future.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. My question is this: Certainly the gentleman does not take the position that Harry Bridges will be accorded any kind of a trial if the original bill is passed? That is the very thing the bill is to be passed for—to deny the right of trial.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; I agree with the gentleman from Utah that that is the purpose of the bill; but, in my opinion, the one who drafted the bill slipped a cog, for if you read the language of the bill you will find it says that Bridges will be deported in the manner provided by sections 155 and 156. Now, section 155 goes into detail and sets forth the various acts for which an alien may be deported. Now, if we pass this bill, before such deportation could take effect he would have to be arrested and charged with a violation of section 155, and, when so charged, necessary proof would be required. Consequently it would mean a sort of a trial or, in other words, some evidence would be required to support the arrest. Section 156 deals with the port to which the alien may be

deported, and costs of transportation, and so forth. I fully realize that no such procedure was contemplated by the author of this bill, but, as I said before, I think the bill is subject to such interpretation; and, as I said, I do not think the bill would accomplish his deportation without trial.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, during the past 2 hours of heated discussion on the pending bill to deport the radical Communist agitator, Harry Bridges, the burden of the argument of those Members who are so violently opposing this legislation is, first, that the bill is unconstitutional, and, second, that they fear the far-reaching effect of this legislation on the future of this country. I shall, therefore, confine my remarks primarily to an effort to answer these two arguments.

Answering the first argument, which has been stressed, as I recall, by every opposition speaker, let me say I yield to no man in my love and devotion to the Constitution of the United States. I believe sincerely that our forefathers were inspired by divine guidance when they wrote that great, sacred document. It is unquestionably the greatest and most profound document of its kind ever penned by mortal man. [Applause.]

During my several years' service in the Congress I have to the best of my ability endeavored to support the spirit as well as the letter of the Constitution of the United States. But I must confess that I am somewhat surprised to find gentlemen here who have never raised a constitutional question against any other bill during their sojourn in this Congress until this day. It is amusing to hear men stand in the Well of this House and plead for the Constitution of the United States who, during the past several years, never thought of raising the question against dozens of other important measures when the question of constitutionality had been seriously raised. It would seem that it depends altogether upon whose ox is being gored as to whether some Members of this body are really concerned as to the constitutionality of legislation under consideration.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], with a husky voice and almost with tears in his eyes, pleads for his fellow traveler, Harry Bridges, in the name of the Constitution of the United States. He has suddenly become very much exercised lest the Congress of the United States might pass an unconstitutional act. It is significant that the gentleman from New York has the distinction of being the only Member of this House who has consistently opposed all of the President's national-defense program.

The fact is that this House has been very charitable in permitting him to read into the RECORD a long, belabored address supposedly prepared by this ex-Communist leader, whose only excuse for not taking out naturalization papers in the 19 years that he has been an unwelcome guest from his native Australia is that he feels that the courts are all bad and prejudiced against him and would not give him a square deal. Frankly, my own feeling is, from a study of his record, that if he had received a square deal that Bridges would have been deported by this Government years ago. [Applause.]

That this body is willing to hear that long statement of defense of Bridges which begs the question and attempts to inject prejudices and side issues into the discussion is a compliment to our democratic form of government. I have repeatedly said that in my judgment we have been entirely too tolerant with the alien enemies within our midst. That is especially true of this particular undesirable alien.

Another distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] talked with a tearful voice about the Constitution of the United States. He, too, has suddenly become deeply concerned about the Constitution. He read into the record a case decided by the court in an effort to prove his contention that this Congress has no legal right under the Constitution

to deport an undesirable alien. You will recall I asked the gentleman how he reached the conclusion that Congress is forbidden under the Constitution to deport an alien while at the same time he himself has introduced more bills than any other Member of Congress to import aliens into the United States and to keep them here after they have been imported. [Applause.]

I have noticed that a number of our learned legal lights of this body, most of whom freely admit that they are great constitutional lawyers, when a bill is presented here in which the public is particularly interested that does not suit them and they can find no other excuse for opposing it, some of them will rush to the Well of this House, get their voices down in their boots, and declare over and over that they are not against the purposes of the bill but their great legal training prevents them from giving their full support to a measure because they are so fearful that the Supreme Court of the United States might declare such legislation unconstitutional.

I have sometimes said that I can take a stick as long as my two fingers and write that one word, "unconstitutional," on the end of it and scare some of the so-called big lawyers on both sides of this aisle almost out of this Capitol.

Let me say in passing that I do not pretend to be a great constitutional lawyer, as so many here today profess to be. I have seriously studied that Constitution since I was a small child. I was taught to memorize not only the preamble but many of its provisions before I was old enough to go to school. I have studied constitutional law all of my life. I have read the constitution of many of the States of the Union and of many of the countries of the Old World. I have studied constitutional law, not only in our schools in America but in one of the best law schools in the Old World, and the more I study our own great Constitution of the United States, the more I am impressed with the necessity of carrying out not only the letter but the spirit of our Constitution. [Applause.] It occurs to me that if the framers of that great document could be listening in on this debate that they would be amazed and somewhat chagrined that Members of the Congress of the United States would actually have the gall to defend an alien enemy who has caused more disturbance in our laboring groups and done more to tear down the spirit of the Constitution of the United States than any other man in America during the past generation. I sincerely believe that the spirit of our beloved and heroic forefathers, if here today, would impel us to send not only alien agitators but all of his kind back to the country from which they came. [Applause.]

But I must not spend all of my time talking about the Constitution. The other point that so many have stressed as to the far-reaching effect of this legislation must not be overlooked. Yes; I agree that this bill, when passed and signed by the President of the United States, will have a far-reaching effect. There is no question about that. It will have the effect of saying to thousands of other alien agitators and racketeers to cease their activities or be prepared to be deported to their home lands. It will have the far-reaching effect of giving notice to the dictators and other enemies of democracy everywhere that there is no room for those who advocate the overthrow of our Government or preach any other ism than old-fashioned Americanism. [Applause.]

It will have the far-reaching effect of giving notice to that entirely too large army in the United States, which we now call the "fifth column," that the Trojan horses in America on which they ride, will not in the future, have such green pastures on which to graze. [Applause.]

Now just a word about the committee amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. CURTIS. As a matter of fact, this committee amendment merely clarifies what the original bill intended to do. It does not deny the right of habeas corpus to determine the question of the right of Congress to pass this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Undoubtedly the gentleman is correct. Let me say here that no Member of this House, so far as I know, would deny anyone their civil rights. And all this talk about denying a citizen or even an alien the right of

habeas corpus is absurd and beside the issue. Of course the Congress has the right to pass a bill to deport an alien within our gates. They are here by the grace of our great benevolent Government. To those aliens who appreciate the protection of American institutions I have nothing but a most kindly feeling, but to that horde of undesirable aliens, who accept the protection of our Government and yet owe their allegiance to a foreign country are in a poor position to whine about their inalienable rights. [Applause.]

My own feeling is that Harry Bridges should count himself lucky to be only deported. In months to come enemy aliens will undoubtedly be dealt with more harshly than just being deported. But bear in mind that is the only thing this committee is now asking—just deport an un-American radical agitator; to send him back to the country that he really loves; send him back to the country that he undoubtedly owes his first and only allegiance. We do not need him and his kind here. Oh, yes; his deportation will have a far-reaching effect, all right. [Applause.]

The record is that Harry Bridges came here in 1921. It took him 7 years to decide that he wanted to take out his second papers, and then when the storm blew over he decided he did not want to become a citizen. Four times he has taken out his first papers and four times he decided he did not think enough of this country to become a citizen of the United States. He has been warned over and over. Again, I say he is fortunate, considering his shameful record, to be only deported back to his homeland. [Applause.]

A few years ago I visited most of the so-called Lowland Countries of Europe. For years all of them have tolerated "fifth column" agitators. Leaders in those countries actually thought such a policy was the liberal thing to do. It was the enemy within their gates that attributed most to their defeat. Surely we have learned a valuable lesson from what we have seen and heard in those little countries of Europe.

Let the word be flashed around the world that the American Congress has finally decided that our Nation will no longer tolerate alien enemies, parasites, or "fifth column" agitators, spies, saboteurs, and other enemies within our borders. They hate our American Constitution, yet when trouble befalls them would use it to protect their dastardly deeds. From henceforth let our motto be lifted high like a beacon light, so that all who run may read, "America for Americans." [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Is the amendment now pending in the form of a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment now pending strikes out all after the enacting clause and inserts other language.

Mr. MICHENER. If that is the case, if this amendment when voted upon is carried there will be no opportunity for further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Not if the amendment is adopted.

Mr. MICHENER. So that all debate must be had on this amendment. The motion to close debate was on this amendment and all amendments thereto. The result, as I understand it, is to close debate on the whole resolution unless the amendment should perchance be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the opinion of the Chair that if the substitute is agreed to under the rule the committee would rise and report the bill to the House.

The Chair has a list of eight Members who have asked for time on this amendment. Sixteen minutes remain. Without objection, the Chair will recognize these gentlemen in the order in which their names appear on this list, for 2 minutes each.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is an amendment to the substitute in order? I have a substitute for the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A substitute for the pending amendment would be in order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I offer a substitute for the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNOR as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: Strike out lines 3, 4, and 5, and insert "That the Attorney General of the United States be, and he is hereby, directed to immediately institute proper proceedings in the proper court to deport Harry Bridges, an alien, in accordance with sections 155 and 156, title VIII, U. S. Code."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, in support of this amendment permit me to call attention to the fact that only recently the President of the United States transferred from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice all matters dealing with immigration. This plan was approved by the Congress. Why? Because the Congress had confidence in the Department of Justice.

If this amendment is adopted, the Attorney General is directed—he would have no discretion—he is directed to institute proper proceedings for the deportation of this man in accordance with the laws of this country.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I am heartily in sympathy with the gentleman's amendment and shall support it. I wish Bridges and many others like him were out of the country. We have laws and we have courts. If our laws are inadequate, let us make them adequate and then depend upon our courts to see that due process of law is carried on. Let us not do the right thing in the wrong way by passing an unconstitutional bill. It should be amended.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman. He is always right. I hope the other Members of the House will also vote for the amendment. Such proceedings would be in accord with our laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have heard many men raise their voices here today in defense of Harry Bridges. But do you realize there are hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of people in this country whose rights have been violated? I have not heard these men raise their voices in their protection.

I want to say to you that Harry Bridges by his own handwriting, by documentary evidence, has perjured himself, according to the record I have read here today. He is guilty of perjury, he is guilty of moral turpitude, he is guilty of disturbing the peace, he is a lawbreaker, he is a "fifth columnist."

It is difficult to conceive that a man can go out on the Pacific coast and blockade that whole coast, all the ports on the Pacific coast, and that man still be allowed to remain in the country. I cannot understand this thing. I do not understand the attitude of you people who defend him.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. No; I have only a short time.

If this is a special bill I say to you that by his actions Harry Bridges has created a special lot of trouble for this country and should be taken out on that account. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the committee, rise?

Mr. MASON. To submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. Is the substitute motion before us now, or the committee amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MASON. And all time for debate on the committee amendment and the substitute will expire at 5 o'clock?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

If the Committee will indulge the Chair, the Chair will state that the Chair has a list of eight Members who were on their feet at the time the gentleman from Montana offered his substitute amendment. Without objection the Chair will recognize these gentlemen in the order in which they appear on this list.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized. Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri to the amendment: After the word "deport", in line 4, strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following: "any undesirable alien who advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States."

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the amendment speaks for itself, and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri) there were—ayes 66, noes 87.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri and Mr. LESINSKI to acts as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 76, noes 119.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GEYER] for one-half minute.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] very often, and again I do not agree with him. I want to read a telegram which shows that not all the people on the Pacific coast feel just exactly as my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD].

This telegram reads as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., June 5, 1940.

HON. LEE GEYER,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Understand House Immigration Committee has just sought to force H. R. 9766 to floor of House. Also understand Congressman KRAMER stated "7,000,000 people in California suffering from the activities of Bridges." We have wired Congressman KRAMER that 200,000 members of Labor's Nonpartisan League of California seriously disagree with him. Opposition to Bridges comes from employer group only. Millions of California workers have benefited directly and indirectly from organizational work of Bridges, who has acted in accordance with law and whose record is without a blemish. His deportation is attack on wages, working conditions, and civil liberties and is without legal or moral justification. Request you inform Congress of incorrectness KRAMER's statement and do all possible to defeat this bill.

E. E. WARD,

State Secretary, Labor's Nonpartisan League of California.

Mr. Chairman, oh, patriotism, what crimes are committed in thy name.

I cannot say that I know Harry Bridges personally as I have met him only casually on two occasions.

I do know this, that several thousand members of his union living in my district have implicit faith in him. They attribute to him the fact that working conditions and wages they receive are much better than before he took the leadership of their organization.

To this fact add that even now this union is negotiating a new contract and you will have the real reason why some deem him to be undesirable. Boiled down to the last analysis we do not hesitate to state that this is the old battle between the union and the employers. Is this Congress going to take sides in this controversy? Are we going to fail to face the issue squarely? Or will we, under the cloak of Americanism, violate those very principles of democracy that we claim to espouse?

I maintain that this body should be the last in the world to succumb to hysteria and establish such a precedent as this just because it is good politics in an election year.

I did not think things would come to such a pass that I should ever hear a member of the Rules Committee so flout the principles of democracy as to make such a statement as I heard in that committee the other day when this bill was

being considered. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] stated, "The Congress needs no reason for deporting a man. It is enough if we do not like the color of his eyes."

This coming from a high-ranking minority member of that powerful committee. If this is an indication of the stabilizing effect of keeping the Congress in session during these critical days then I say the sooner we go home the better.

Much has been said against this man and the labor organization he heads. He has been proved by a judicial procedure not to be guilty as charged. In the United States I thought only the guilty were punished and then after due process of law. We are importing Hitler methods. Can we protect democracy by destroying it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], neither one of whom can be accused of being sympathizers with subversive activities. They have ascended to the heights of true statesmanship today, rising above passion, and voting their convictions to maintain the Constitution, which they swore to uphold and defend against enemies from within and without. They are great statesmen and they voted their constitutional convictions. [Applause.]

A few days ago I was one of those who blocked unanimous consent for the House passage, without debate or study, of the Allen bill to deport Harry Bridges. My reason for doing so was that the measure was highly controversial and that I wanted ample time to be accorded to the proponents and opponents to discuss it. Personally, I was and am convinced that the proposed bill is unconstitutional and that the Members should know the course they were pursuing in this connection. For that reason I voted today in favor of the rule on the bill. I hoped that full and fair discussion would be given to the merits and demerits of the measure and that it might be amended so as to make it apply to general classes rather than to individuals; and, failing that, that we might get the bill recommitted with specific instructions to improve it.

Mr. Chairman, we are again approaching the hysteria days of 1916-17, when rational people seem to be inspired by hatred and intolerance, when emotions often dethrone reason, and when normally sober citizens in their excitement favor legislation which they ordinarily would quickly condemn. I am not on this floor today in the capacity of a champion of Harry Bridges. I hold no brief for or against him. It may be that he is guilty of all of the charges of misconduct and subversive activities directed against him. For the sake of argument it might even be assumed that he was a Communist, though Dean James M. Landis, dean of the Harvard Law School, after protracted hearings and listening to full evidence, exonerated him of that charge. The fate of Harry Bridges is not the point. He is but an incident. I personally condemn individuals and organizations who plot to overthrow our form of government by force and violence. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, our Constitution guarantees to every resident of our land full civil rights and the democratic process. Some of the leading newspapers in America, in their editorial columns, have condemned this measure on the ground that it is unprecedented; that it would establish a dangerous precedent; that it violates the Constitution in that it is a bill of attainder, prohibited by section 9, article I, of the Constitution of the United States. By permission of the House I am including a few pertinent extracts from these editorials. It will be noted that these editorials are taken from some of the most conservative Republican newspapers in the United States.

One of our main difficulties is to divorce cold logic from sentiment. It has often been said that no person is eligible for a judgeship who is incapable of hearing testimony and making decisions without emotional bias. A man is said to possess a judicial temperament when he can view a situation objectively, dispassionately, and realistically. One of the foibles of mankind, however, is that too many of us decide questions from our subjective reactions rather than

from our objective reactions. In the trial of a criminal case opposing counsel and the judge sedulously endeavor to secure a jury which will decide the facts of the case impartially. We do not go into a criminal case with our minds made up against the criminal beforehand.

Even to the most despicable criminal, palpably guilty of the most revolting crime, we who are lawyers, and who under oath have sworn to uphold the Constitution, should and would insist there be given every protection guaranteed under the law—that is the principle for which our remote Anglo-Saxon ancestors fought through the centuries and which was graven in the Magna Carta at Runnymede in 1215. Are we going to proclaim here today that the Constitution be suspended in periods of excitement, when we are worried about a war in Europe, though this country itself is not engaged in war? Are we going to take an action which will be tantamount to a blackout of civil liberties for those with whom we disagree? Are we going to deny the soundness of the immortal statement ascribed to the French novelist, Voltaire, when he said substantially in these words: "I wholly disagree with what you say, but I will fight to the death to uphold your right to say it"? Does this Congress repudiate the political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, who drafted, sponsored, and guided through to enactment our Bill of Rights, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States? Are we going to be intimidated here today into failing to do our sworn duty and into flouting the Constitution because of fear of political repercussions?

I deny that a no vote on the pending bill proves, or even indicates, a sympathy for Harry Bridges personally, or approval of the course he has pursued as a labor leader or as a resident of our country. I emphatically deny such a conclusion. I denounce those who visit upon us condemnation for doing our constitutional duty. Every criminal should be accorded his day in court. Even a murderer has a right to a trial by jury; the right to be confronted by his accusers; the right to be represented throughout his trial by counsel; the right to help in the selection of the jury; and other kindred privileges. These we have denied the prisoner at the bar here today.

O, Mr. Chairman, this Congress is about to embark upon an unprecedented course. We are going to pass a bill which has no parallel in American history. This bill denies due process guaranteed under the fifth amendment. The committee reporting out this bill refused to accord Bridges even a hearing. If the bill is valid, why has no similar bill ever passed Congress?

I am including herein a brief which I contend overwhelmingly establishes the invalidity of this measure. The Van Zandt amendment makes the measure even more unconstitutional in that it attempts to deny the right of securing a writ of habeas corpus to the person affected. I have heard some peculiar law discussed on this floor today. It has been said that because Congress passes private bills permitting certain designated aliens to remain in the country, or granting them rights under the immigration laws, Congress ergo has the corresponding right in a private bill directed against one named individual to deport an alien.

With all the vehemence and emphasis at my command I deny the logic of such an argument. It is not recognized in the courts. It is elementary law, that in the former case we are granting a privilege, while in the latter case we are imposing a penalty. In Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence these categories have been clearly distinguished through the centuries.

The truth of the matter is there are some here who unconsciously would deny civil liberties to aliens, or who sincerely believe that the Constitution was not intended to be a bulwark of protection to those with whom we disagree on economic or political matters.

Senators Norris, of Nebraska, La Follette, of Wisconsin, and the late Senator Borah, of Idaho, have frequently insisted that the most distinguishing characteristic of a democracy is its guarantee of civil rights to all within the borders of that democracy. One of Senator Borah's last speeches was a warning that under the impact of a war hysteria, amid the

jitters generated by fears and hatreds springing from the problems of a war-torn world, there would be a crack-down upon liberal groups and individuals, upon labor leaders and organizations, upon religious leaders and sects, upon racial groups and dissident minorities in general.

Germany went through that process. We want no Hitlerism here. No matter in what beguiling dress tendencies toward fascism may be cloaked, I warn this House we must resist them. I affirm my patriotism and loyalty to the United States—no one need question that. I repudiate extremisms. It is because I love my country and its institutions that I want no law passed here which aims at its vitals. My colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], a jurist of distinction and wide and varied experience, has given us his considered opinion to the effect that this bill was clearly unconstitutional. When such a high-minded statesman as the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] indicates by his vote his conclusions that this bill is invalid, it should be reassuring to many. It will be noted that among those voting "no" on this measure are some of the most conservative Members of this House, men who despite their hearty disagreement with the philosophy and activities of Harry Bridges nevertheless cannot stomach this method of attack upon him.

Of course, this Congress has the right to deport aliens—not by directing a bill against an individual without providing that that individual be accorded every right under the law, but by passing a bill dealing with aliens in categories. I shall discuss that matter more fully in the brief.

In my home city of Tacoma there is published the Tacoma Labor Advocate, the official organ of the central labor council of that city. This is the federation of unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. There has been friction between Bridges and these unions for some time, as he has been an officer of a rival labor organization. Nevertheless, despite the bitter anger of the A. F. of L. unions at Bridges and their condemnation of him personally and as a labor leader, these unions, speaking through their official organ, the Tacoma Labor Advocate, denounced the Allen bill as "an absurd proposal." The editorial clearly sets forth the strong feelings of these A. F. of L. unionists in antipathy to everything about Bridges, but they warmly declare in this editorial that the Allen bill is a "disgraceful move" and that it is an "ungodly measure."

The editorial is as follows:

[From the Tacoma Labor Advocate of May 24, 1940]

AN ABSURD PROPOSAL

Just about the time that Harry Bridges is losing prestige among the workers, someone, somewhere, devises a way of galvanizing his reputation, however faded as a labor leader, back into life.

The latest effort in this direction is to pass a special law to deport him. No excuse is offered for such summary legislation. It is just a means of getting rid of one that is presumed to be objectionable.

Now no labor or other paper has indulged in strictures to the extent of the Tacoma Labor Advocate against Harry Bridges, and from first to last we have frankly regarded him as a fakir of the first degree. But in spite of that we may say that we are definitely opposed to any such legislation as that now pending in the Congress to get rid of the Australian.

Bridges, as a British subject, has as much right here as any American, under treaties with Great Britain. As long as he is not shown to be violating the law, his presence here is condoned by treaty which precedes any law that Congress may enact. And because that is the case, we suspect that back of this legislation there is a sinister effort to popularize and to rehabilitate Bridges in the public mind.

He can pose as a martyr for the working-class doctrines that he pretends to hold. And just as the trial or hearing by Dean Landis proved such a mint to the cause, so this new statute which it is proposed to enact to deport him is so well calculated to restore Bridges to popular good will, we regard it with a good deal of suspicion.

The workers cannot at the present stage of things regard Bridges as anything else but a phoney fourflusher. And his scheme stolen, according to Faisie, from the bosses, of a 5-year peace, should have the effect of weaning the last vestige of favor from this man who betrays them.

We don't know who has been backing Bridges. We don't know what form of support has been forthcoming to supply him with a martyr's garb every time that his stock gets below par. We do know that that is exactly what has happened, and we are very suspicious of these efforts to deport Bridges, whose actions in our

estimation show that he is not the friend of the longshoremen but the friend of the groups definitely opposing the longshoremen.

Whether this group is the Railroad Trust, as some suspect, or not, we cannot pretend to know; nor can we say that they have any hidden or open alliance with Bridges.

We do know that as a result of Bridges' operation and administration of the Pacific coast water-front union business, general business has sunk and sunk until it reached so low a minimum that its revival is impossible to figure. We note that the perishable trade, the citrus trade, the lumber trade, the many and various kinds of freight that once were brought and shipped hither and yon by the shipping on the Pacific coast, now goes that way no more. Instead the freight finds its way by truck or by railroad car, while, bit by bit, the coastal shipping trade languishes.

That trade languishes because they couldn't depend upon the operation of the docks and the movement of freight, what with strikes of one kind or another sponsored or authorized under Bridges' administration, and things have reached such a pass that it seems to many that freight movements by sea have been lost forever to coastal shipping, while railways and trucks enjoy it instead—and Bridges organizes his inland warehousemen, or says he does.

The last act for which Bridges acquired fame was a proposal to sell the workers down the river for a 5-year peace pact, with arbitration thrown in, and the workers compelled to accept present conditions as if, even with war in Europe or in America, prices could be stabilized and wages with them. This notorious act has scandalized even some of Bridges' most loyal followers. He may explain that he desires this peace so that he can march inland to secure into his organization the warehousemen far beyond the Cascades, the Sierras, and the Rockies, and for which organization the longshoremen must pay.

Naturally, Bridges needs some sort of a restorative to a waning reputation, and naturally the bill to deport him—to deport him personally as a special order of Government business—is just what is calculated to make the people believe that he is still the matchless leader, still the militant chief, still the undaunted hero that won all his strikes, and all that sort of "hokey" which his "Commy" colleagues built up for him must be true.

We wonder what stooge of the party line, posing as an opponent of subversive doctrines, suggested that ungodly measure to deport Bridges—to deport him just now when his stock has sunk below the zero mark.

I have been much influenced in my course on this bill by the conclusions of this editorial. There is no question but what the passage of this measure will have a tendency to martyrize Bridges in the eyes of extremists. There are legal and illegal ways of accomplishing one's objective. I consider this Allen bill ultra vires of Congress under the Constitution. I denominate this measure by a term commonly found in the parlance of lawyers, "sui generis"—a kind unto itself. I defy the bill's proponents to find any justification in the writings of legal scholars, in the decisions handed down by jurists, to justify their contention that this bill will survive in the Federal courts.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against the instant measure, convinced as I am that the bill is unconstitutional.

From the New York Herald Tribune comes the following editorial:

DANGEROUS DEPARTURE

Very possibly Congress has the constitutional right to order the deportation of Harry Bridges. But, to pass a bill for the purpose aimed at an individual would be an unprecedented step which all Americans should view with grave misgivings.

The readers of this newspaper hardly need a reminder of its attitude toward the west coast labor leader and its demand that he be put through the mill of deportation proceedings. But though we found it difficult to agree with Dean Landis, who conducted the hearings in the case, that Bridges was not a Communist or otherwise a fit subject for deportation, his formal verdict, we felt, should end the controversy.

It should end it for the simple reason that, whether mistaken or not, it was arrived at after a full and fair consideration of the facts, and by that due process of law which is the bulwark of our liberties. Bridges is not a citizen of the United States. Technically, therefore, he may not be immune to congressional action of the sort contemplated. Nevertheless such action, if not a violation of the Constitution, would constitute a breach of the traditional policy of the country that aliens, as well as citizens, are entitled to the equal protection of its laws. We can far better afford to harbor Bridges than to permit Congress to single him out for punishment.

The Los Angeles Times has been famous in the past for its fights with labor unions and leaders. Yet it strongly questions the wisdom of this bill.

TO DEPORT BRIDGES

The House Immigration Committee took the unusual step yesterday of voting to approve, after only 1 day's consideration, a bill to deport Harry Bridges, alien radical labor leader. The bill was introduced by Representative ALLEN of Louisiana on Tuesday.

ALLEN declared Congress should act specifically when alien radicals escape through a technicality.

The technicality in this case is that James M. Landis chose not to believe the sworn testimony of American citizens and to believe Bridges and that Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins backed him up with an almost audible sigh of relief.

Congress would be justified in feeling considerable impatience under the circumstances, but such legislation sets a rather bad precedent. If the heavy artillery of a congressional enactment must be dragged out to demolish all the nuisances that need deportation, it would seem simpler to revise the existing deportation machinery. Why not transfer immigration and deportation to the State Department? Secretary Hull would have Bridges out of the country in short order.

See also the editorial appearing in the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press:

DEPORTING BRIDGES

When Dean James M. Landis, of Harvard, decided in a special hearing for the Department of Labor that Harry Bridges, west-coast, Australian-born labor leader, was not a proven Communist and therefore not deportable, it was freely predicted that this was not the final word on the Bridges case. Now the House Immigration Committee has approved a bill aimed specifically at the deportation of this man.

Whether this measure would stand up in the courts may be doubted. Even if it would, it seems to establish a very bad precedent. The enactment of special legislation for the deportation of a specific individual would set up the possibility of many abuses. It would then be possible to frame measures to get rid of any person against whom popular prejudice might be directed by specific charges framed to fit the case.

It has been suggested that it might be wholly proper to enact regulations which would call for the deportation of aliens who have failed to take out citizenship papers after remaining in this country a certain number of years. Even legislation of this type would require careful exceptions so that injustices would not be done.

It seems quite logical, nevertheless, to insist that aliens who come into this country to make their homes should be required to accept citizenship after a specified period unless there is some good excuse for not doing so. Bridges has had ample opportunity to become a citizen but has failed to take advantage of it.

It would not be wise, however, to seek Bridges' ouster through a special measure aimed at him alone. Unless he is deportable under laws applicable to all aliens and under regulations that would apply impartially to all, it would be better that he remained. What the Immigration Committee is proposing is, in effect, the substitution of legislative for judicial procedure. It is an encroachment of the legislative on the judicial branch of the Government, which is a practice that has been roundly condemned.

The author of the bill, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN], admits frankly that he is "striking out on a new and untried route." The Nashville (Tenn.) Banner, in an editorial summarizes the situation by saying that the proper way to get at the situation is not through the form of such a bill as is proposed.

In the Evening Post, of New York City, appears an editorial which speaks for itself:

IN CONTEMPT OF LAW

Congress has before it a bill which would deport Harry Bridges, leader of the C. I. O. on the West Coast. It is an extraordinary measure. It makes no attempt to establish a rule which would apply to all aliens or define some new class of offense which would be grounds for deportation. The bill simply says point blank, that Harry Bridges should be made to leave the United States.

Those responsible for drawing the legislation apparently forget the fundamental tradition in America that aliens as well as citizens are entitled to the equal protection of our laws.

Mr. Bridges has already gone through the proper process of deportation proceedings. After a careful and full consideration of the facts of his case it has been determined, by formal verdict, that he is not a fit subject for deportation.

Congress should not now attempt to short-circuit the due process of the deportation by passing a law directed at a single person. No individual could be as dangerous as the principle the bill contains.

The San Francisco Chronicle recently published an article by a leading conservative Republican, Chester Rowell, closely identified with Herbert Hoover, in which he denounces the bill as unconstitutional and a highly dangerous and unprecedented step. The Chronicle has editorially expressed opposition to the bill, likewise. As the Chronicle articles have appeared already in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I shall not include them again here.

Here is an interesting editorial from the News of Charlotte, N. C.:

KILLING CURE—A BILL WHICH ADOPTS NAZI PRINCIPLES TO GET A "RED"

The bill to deport Harry Bridges, west coast labor leader, reported out by the Immigration Committee of the House, is a cunning

attempt to capitalize on the alarm in the country to accomplish an ulterior end.

There are few people left in the country who will deny that in the present case Bridges is dangerous. Whether he is a Communist or not, he is certainly taking the Communist line, and at his instigation his maritime unions are busily denouncing the Roosevelt arms program as a capitalist plot to betray the country into war.

He ought to be got rid of, and so ought the rest of the Communist agents in the unions, but by a law which shows some decent regard for the safety of the rights guaranteed under the Bill of Rights.

The present bill is in effect an effort to deal with the Trojan horse danger in the country by plopping whole hog for Nazi methods. It violates every American tradition in singling out an individual and making a law against him for what is not, under existing law, a crime in itself.

One of the strongest of a series of editorials appearing in that great newspaper, the Washington Post, is the one which was printed in its issue of May 30, 1940, and which refers to the instant measure as "striking at democracy." This is the editorial:

STRIKING AT DEMOCRACY

A bill by Representative ALLEN of Louisiana, calls for the deportation of Harry R. Bridges, west coast labor leader. Naturally, protests have come from the defense committee formed when Bridges was facing deportation proceedings. But the larger issue raised by this proposal is whether a breach shall be made in the Constitution to strike at a leader of the C. I. O.

James M. Landis, dean of the Harvard Law School, presided for many weeks at hearings to determine whether Mr. Bridges was deportable as an enemy of the established political order. Mr. Landis concluded that the tactics followed by the C. I. O. labor leader were not revolutionary but in accord with democratic principles. The case against Mr. Bridges was accordingly dropped, and there is no excuse for treating him as other than a law-abiding citizen.

The Allen bill is plainly unconstitutional, and it seems entirely unlikely that it will receive serious consideration. However, it is well to call attention to the extremes to which some Members of Congress are prepared to go to rid the country of aliens whom they regard as undesirable.

The framers of the Constitution were aware of the dangers of permitting the Legislature to punish individuals without benefit of trial. Hence they forbade Congress to pass bills of attainder—bills that are a species of extrajudicial procedure, for the direct punishment of political offenders.

It does not require a knowledge of constitutional law to realize the enormity of a proposal that would condemn a man to deportation by a mere legislative decree. Lightning thus invoked might strike anybody who happened to incur the displeasure of Congress. It would not be necessary to limit attacks to aliens whose radical views and union activities have made them objects of dislike and suspicion to influential groups.

Even Mr. Bridges' worst enemies would have cause to regret his departure if it were effected by ignoring constitutional prohibitions against the kind of legislation Representative ALLEN of Louisiana has proposed.

I call the attention of the Members that two veterans of the first World War who have as outstanding records for bravery and courage as any men in the United States, voted against this measure, along with some other veterans. These men are the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC], who is a holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor, and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER], who lost both legs while serving in the aviation branch of the American Expeditionary Forces in France. I make this statement in praise of these two gentlemen without any invidious reflection upon the other veterans who are Members of this House.

I now come to the legal argument from the constitutional angle which I have prepared and which I suggest be read carefully by those lawyers in the House who have an open mind.

THE BILL (H. R. 9766) TO DEPORT HARRY BRIDGES IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

H. R. 9766 would authorize and direct the Secretary of Labor to take into custody and deport to Australia the alien, Harry Bridges. This bill is an unprecedented attempt to have Congress depart entirely from its legislative function and pass judgment upon a single individual. The sponsors of the bill undoubtedly rely upon the fact that the power of Congress over the admission and deportation of aliens has been upheld by the courts in very broad terms. They have apparently assumed that the broad power of Congress over this subject permits it to disregard the Constitution entirely in dealing with aliens. There is no basis for this assumption. On the contrary, the Constitution does apply, and it does set certain limits upon the action of Congress, limits which are exceeded by the present bill.

Two provisions of the Constitution are pertinent, the prohibition against bills of attainder in article I, section 9, and the due-process clause of the fifth amendment. Persuasive analogy condemns the bill under the first of these clauses; precedents clearly in point establish its invalidity under the second. Since the case is so strong under the due-process clause, and there are no decisions directly in point under article I, section 9, it is unnecessary to venture the prediction that the bill would be held a bill of attainder. The few authorities which have discussed bills of attainder do show, however, the radical conflict between the present bill and the basic constitutional concepts which the courts have read into the due-process clause. They thus strengthen the argument that the proposed bill violates the fifth amendment. For this reason, consideration will be given first to the clause prohibiting bills of attainder, and then to the authorities establishing the invalidity of the bill under the fifth amendment.

I. BILLS OF ATTAINDER

Article I, section 9, imposes upon Congress the restriction that, "No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed." That provision, and the like prohibition upon the States imposed by article I, section 10, have been extensively discussed by the Supreme Court only in the test oath cases that arose immediately after the Civil War (*Cummings v. Missouri*, 4 Wall. 277; *Ex parte Garland*, 4 Wall. 333). The legislation there before the Court prohibited the holding of office and the practice of the professions by persons who failed to take an oath that they had not adhered to the cause of the enemies of the United States. The Missouri statute had been applied to prevent Cummings from practicing as a priest. The Federal statute had been applied to prevent Garland from appearing as an attorney in the courts of the United States. Both acts were held invalid as bills of attainder. In the *Cummings* case, the Court wrote (4 Wall. at 323):

A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial.

If the punishment be less than death, the act is termed a bill of pains and penalties. Within the meaning of the Constitution, bills of attainder include bills of pains and penalties. In these cases the legislative body, in addition to its legitimate functions, exercises the powers and office of judge; it assumes, in the language of the textbooks, judicial magistracy; it pronounces upon the guilt of the party, without any of the forms or safeguards of trial; it determines the sufficiency of the proofs produced, whether conformable to the rules of evidence or otherwise; and it fixes the degree of punishment in accordance with its own notions of the enormity of the offense.

Since it will undoubtedly be argued that the present bill is not a bill of attainder because deportation is not a criminal proceeding, it is significant that the acts held invalid by the Supreme Court in the test oath cases did not unconditionally impose criminal penalties.

It has been held that the prohibition against bills of attainder bars legislative acts confiscating property no less than those which impose punishment upon the individual (*Gaines v. Buford*, 31 Ky. 481, 509-510).

See also a statement to the same effect by Chief Justice Marshall in *Fletcher v. Peck* (6 Cranch 87, 138). And in the only case that has been found in which this clause of the Constitution has been considered in relation to a deportation law, the Court wrote:

A legislative act which undertakes to inflict the punishment of banishment or exile from the United States on a citizen thereof, and thereby deprive him of the right to live in the country, for any cause or no cause, or because of his race or color, is a bill of attainder within the clause of the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the passage of such bills and is therefore void (*In re Yung Sing Hee*, 36 Fed. 437, 439).

The case for the present bill is not aided by the authorities (e. g. *Mahler v. Eby*, 264 U. S. 32) holding that the prohibition against ex post facto laws does not apply to statutes specifying the grounds for deportation. It is firmly established that that prohibition relates only to criminal laws (*Calder v. Bull*, 3 Dall. 386, 390; *Johannessen v. United States*, 225 U. S. 227, 242).

The authorities which have been cited show that bills of attainder are not so limited. Since they include acts con-

fiscating property and those depriving persons of the liberty to engage in a profession, there is every reason why the law imposing the much more drastic penalty of deportation should be held within the constitutional ban. For the essential vice of a bill of attainder is the corruption of the legislative process that it represents. The case against them was put by Mr. Justice Story in the following words:

Bills of attainder, as they are technically called, are such special acts of the legislature as inflict capital punishments upon persons supposed to be guilty of high offenses, such as treason and felony, without any conviction in the ordinary course of judicial proceedings. If an act inflicts a milder degree of punishment than death, it is called a bill of pains and penalties. But in the sense of the Constitution, it seems that bills of attainder include bills of pains and penalties; for the Supreme Court has said, "A bill of attainder may affect the life of an individual, or may confiscate his property, or both." In such cases, the legislature assumes judicial magistracy, pronouncing upon the guilt of the party without any of the common forms and guards of trial, and satisfying itself with proofs, when such proofs are within its reach, whether they are conformable to the rules of evidence or not. In short, in all such cases the legislature exercises the highest power of sovereignty, and what may be properly deemed an irresponsible despotic discretion, being governed solely by what it deems political necessity or expediency, and too often under the influence of unreasonable fears, or unfounded suspicions. * * * The punishment has often been inflicted without calling upon the party accused to answer, or without even the formality of proof; and sometimes, because the law, in its ordinary course of proceedings, would acquit the offender. The injustice and iniquity of such acts, in general, constitute an irresistible argument against the existence of the power. In a free government it would be intolerable; and in the hands of a reigning faction it might be, and probably would be, abused to the ruin and death of the most virtuous citizens. Bills of this sort have been most usually passed in England in times of rebellion, or of gross subservency to the crown, or of violent political excitements; periods in which all nations are most liable (as well the free as the enslaved) to forget their duties, and to trample upon the rights and liberties of others. (Story on the Constitution, 4th edition, vol. 2, sec. 1344).

The relevance of Justice Story's comments to the present proposal need not be elaborated. It is sufficient to note that this bill has been advanced not, as Story put it, "because the law, in its ordinary course of proceedings, would acquit the offender," but after he has been acquitted in the ordinary proceeding.

II. THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE

As has been stated, if the present bill were attacked in the courts, it would be unnecessary to decide whether or not it is a bill of attainder because the case against it is so clear under the due process clause of the fifth amendment. Regardless of the nature of the proceeding, that clause affords to every person threatened with the loss of life, liberty, or property a certain safeguard regarding the procedure by which the threatened deprivation may be effected. It applies as fully to the entry of a money judgment without notice and opportunity for hearing as to a conviction for crime without opportunity for defense. (*Pennoyer v. Neff*, 95 U. S. 714; *Powell v. Alabama*, 287 U. S. 45). Its guarantees protect not only citizens but also aliens who are within the borders of the United States (*Yong Wing v. United States*, 163 U. S. 228, 230; *The Japanese Immigrant Case*, 189 U. S. 86, 100-101; *Russian Volunteer Fleet v. United States*, 282 U. S. 481, 492).

The case in support of the present bill is necessarily based upon the extremely broad power of Congress over the deportation of aliens, a power which has been characterized by the Supreme Court as "political," not one which punishes for crime (*Mahler v. Eby*, 264 U. S. 32, 39, 40; see also *Fong Yue Ting v. United States*, 149 U. S. 698; *Lem Moon Sing v. United States*, 158 U. S. 538).

The effect of those and the many other decisions on the point is well summarized in *Zakonaite v. Wolf* (226 U. S. 272), where the Court wrote, at page 275:

It is entirely settled that the authority of Congress to prohibit aliens from coming within the United States, and to regulate their coming, includes authority to impose conditions upon the performance of which the continued liberty of the alien to reside within the bounds of this country may be made to depend; that a proceeding to enforce such regulations is not a criminal prosecution within the meaning of the fifth and sixth amendments; that such an inquiry may be properly devolved upon an executive department or subordinate officials thereof; and that the findings of fact reached by such officials, after a fair, though summary, hearing, may constitutionally be made conclusive. * * *

In this very case, however, the Court considered on the merits the claim advanced by the alien as a matter of constitutional right that there was no adequate evidence to support the deportation order. In spite of the validity of the statute making final the determination of the Secretary of Labor, that question—and all other contentions going to the unfairness of the procedure followed by the Secretary—may be reviewed on habeas corpus. (See *Turner v. Williams*, 194 U. S. 279; *Bilokumsky v. Tod*, 263 U. S. 149; *Vajtauer v. Commissioner*, 273, U. S. 103.)

This use of habeas corpus is not expressly provided for by statute. It is permitted because of the constitutional right of the alien to a degree of fairness in the proceeding, the minimum essential element of due process of law. As the Court stated in the *Vajtauer case*, *supra* (273 U. S. at 106):

Deportation without a fair hearing or on charges unsupported by any evidence is a denial of due process which may be corrected on habeas corpus.

See also *Kwock Jan Fat v. White* (253 U. S. 454, 464), where the Court wrote, at page 464:

The acts of Congress give great power to the Secretary of Labor over Chinese immigrants and persons of Chinese descent. It is a power to be administered, not arbitrarily and secretly but fairly and openly, under the restraints of the tradition and principles of free government applicable where the fundamental rights of men are involved, regardless of their origin or race. It is the province of the courts, in proceedings for review, within the limits amply defined in the cases cited, to prevent abuse of this extraordinary power, and this is possible only when a full record is preserved of the essentials on which the executive officers proceed to judgment. For failure to preserve such a record for the information, not less of the Commissioner of Immigration and of the Secretary of Labor than for the courts, the judgment in this case must be reversed.

The invalidity of a deportation order based on the direction of Congress, with no semblance of a hearing or proceeding of any kind to which the alien is a party, is established beyond a doubt by those cases in which orders have been annulled on habeas corpus. In *Kwock Jan Fat* against *White*, *supra*, the vice in the procedure followed by the officer who heard the case was that no record was kept of important testimony, which was thus not placed before the Secretary of Labor or made available for the consideration of the courts on habeas corpus. In *Chin Low v. United States* (208 U. S. 8) a writ was issued because the petitioner had been denied an opportunity to obtain witnesses in support of his right to enter the country.

The attempt to support the present bill by argument from the admitted power to entrust the function of adjudication to administrative officers proves too much. For, at least in the case of one arriving at our borders and seeking admission to the country, administrative power may finally determine the rights not only of aliens, but also of citizens (*United States v. Ju Toy*, 198 U. S. 253).

In that case it was held that where admission is denied by the administrative official to whom the power of final decision was conferred, a claim of citizenship—without a showing that the administrative procedure had been unfair—did not authorize the issuance of a writ of habeas corpus. To hold, therefore, that the power to commit adjudication to an administrative officer establishes the power of Congress to make the adjudication itself would require the conclusion that Congress could, by special act, bar admission to this country to an American citizen who had temporarily gone abroad. This shocking conclusion would not be countenanced by any court.

Of far greater importance than the treatment to be accorded to the single individual against whom this bill is directed is the effect of this proposed legislation on the maintenance of our constitutional form of government. For the first time in our history Congress proposes to depart from its traditional function of prescribing the rule by which adjudication, whether in the courts or by administrative officers, is to proceed, and to make the adjudication itself. By this invasion of the field which the Constitution marks out for the other branches of the Government, Congress would do a wrong not only to Harry Bridges but to the very system which it seeks to protect against Harry Bridges. The wrong to Bridges is a denial of due process of law, which the courts

would correct by writ of habeas corpus. The wrong caused by an ill-considered attempt to usurp unconstitutional power is one which Congress alone can prevent.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] for one-half minute.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I cannot vote in favor of this bill providing specifically for the immediate deportation of Harry Bridges. I do not believe that anyone who listened to the very profound speech of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] can have any doubt that the bill violates some of the most basic provisions of the Constitution of the United States and is, in fact, a usurpation of judicial functions which properly belong to the administrative and judicial branches.

The practical effect of the passage of this bill is obvious to me. It will bring about an entirely disproportionate magnification of the importance of Harry Bridges in the eyes of many people. I will not be surprised if effort will be made to get up a national movement for the protection of Bridges' rights. Money will be raised from all sorts of people for this purpose. The Senate will be bombarded with appeals of every sort. Should the bill pass that body, the President will then be confronted with the problem of either signing a bill which has been clearly shown to violate the Constitution, or to veto a bill aimed at the deportation of a man who has been for many years in this country without becoming a citizen and whose influence within the labor movement has been, to state the matter conservatively, by no means always constructive. Should the bill become law, there will then be started by interested groups a process of litigation in the courts of the country which undoubtedly will be carried to the highest court in the land, where, in the opinion of far abler students of constitutional law than I, there is hardly a chance that it will be upheld. The net effect of a process of this kind on the apparent importance of Mr. Bridges in the country is too obvious to require any expansion on my part.

For the information of the House, I may say that I know that there are a great many solid leaders within the ranks of labor on the Pacific coast, including the C. I. O., who believe that the labor movement would be much better off if Mr. Bridges were not in this country. Nor can I substantially disagree with many of the things that have been said on the floor today about his altogether probable past connections with the Communist Party. The fact remains, however, that through the use of the due process set-up for dealing with cases of this kind, the Government has so far not succeeded in proving charges against Mr. Bridges which would give ground for his deportation. What Congress is really doing here is saying that, although a deportation trial has been held, and although the decision was rendered against the deportation of Bridges, nevertheless the House just does not like him, and although it is not able to charge him with any deportable offense which has been proved, it proposes to deport him on general principles and without any further hearing, although even as an alien he is unquestionably entitled to due process under the fifth amendment to the Constitution. Such a bill as this has never in all the history of the Republic been passed by the Congress; nor, so far as I know, has such a bill ever been introduced. Those who have urged so vigorously that an object lesson be provided through the case of Mr. Bridges can, it seems to me, feel that this has been done by these facts alone. The possible consequences, however, of having Congress embark upon a procedure of this kind at a time like this, when there is so much tendency throughout the country already to short-circuit the law and our democratic procedure, are perfectly tremendous.

Many Members have already stated that this would be but the first of a series of similar actions. In other words, we are to have bills introduced against many specific individuals who have offended some Member of Congress or other and calling for the deportation of those persons.

I could name a dozen aliens in the country, one of them at the head of a great foreign-propaganda organization which pours out literature in defense of a foreign dictatorship by the ton, that I personally would like to see out of the country.

Once we start on this process, however, with regard to any human being, the very human rights which our national-defense program aims to protect are likely to be worth very little. Then there is the further question as to whether we would have this bill before us if Bridges had not been an aggressive labor leader.

Finally, let me point out that only recently we have transferred the Bureau of Immigration to the Department of Justice, that there is an orderly and established process whereby deportation proceedings can be carried on and that this is the process which should be used. Along this line, I voted in favor of an amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] which would have directed the Attorney General to proceed in this manner, and I would have voted for the bill had that amendment replaced its present language. I also voted in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON], since it would have made the bill a matter of general law without reference to a particular individual and would have thus removed its unconstitutional features. In this and all similar cases, if the law contains loopholes which render it impossible to take orderly action in cases of real subversive activity, then it is the law which should be changed rather than to try to circumvent it by legislative monstrosities of this sort. Furthermore, do any Members of the House doubt for a moment that constant surveillance is being maintained by interested groups to catch Mr. Bridges in some action which would offer substantial and provable grounds for his deportation under the provisions of existing law?

I wish to include herewith with my remarks portions of two editorials appearing on this subject, one from the San Francisco Chronicle, an outstanding conservative California newspaper, and the other from the Washington post.

San Francisco Chronicle:

Congress is still playing with the idea of deporting Harry Bridges by bill of attainder, regardless of the constitutional prohibition of such a process. It is a curious paradox that those who shout most loudly for the Constitution are often those least familiar with its provisions and least concerned for granting to others the rights it guarantees to themselves. In this case, since the effort to deport Bridges by due process of law failed on a finding of want of proof, it is proposed to substitute undue process of attainder. For surely, these objectors conclude, Bridges is an undesirable alien, since they do not desire him. And if it is pointed out that there is no general law for the deportation of aliens merely because they are undesirable, what could be simpler than a special law for the deportation of this particular undesired one?

The Washington Post:

The framers of the Constitution were aware of the dangers of permitting the legislature to punish individuals without benefit of trial. Hence they forbade Congress to pass bills of attainder—bills that are a species of extrajudicial procedure, for the direct punishment of political offenders.

It does not require a knowledge of constitutional law to realize the enormity of a proposal that would condemn a man to deportation by a mere legislative decree. Lightning thus invoked might strike anybody who happened to incur the displeasure of Congress. It would not be necessary to limit attacks to aliens whose radical views and union activities have made them objects of dislike and suspicion to influential groups.

Even Mr. Bridges' worst enemies would have cause to regret his departure if it were effected by ignoring constitutional prohibitions against the kind of legislation Representative ALLEN has proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL].

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have been gathering material for 2 years to write a speech about Harry Bridges, and now I get a half minute to make it in. I shall vote for the Van Zandt amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, much has been said about this bill becoming a precedent. Let it be a precedent and let those who should, take warning.

Today happens to be the day when, I understand, the Bureau of Immigration goes over to the Department of Justice. Let it also be the day when America takes charge of her own destiny and says that we have the right to combat the "fifth column" according to the means that we find neces-

sary in order to preserve the integrity and the life of the United States. [Applause.]

We have been told by the chairman of the Dies committee that the "fifth column," so-called, presents a new problem in the life of nations; that Norway was unable to meet it successfully; that other nations have found it difficult to meet.

I do not maintain that the passage of a bill that singles out one solitary individual for deportation is the answer to the problem—far from it, yet it is the only opportunity that has been given this body to speak what America thinks of this thing—the insidious penetration of our institutions by aliens who seek to undermine the country whose guests they are. They come here as guests; they should not pull down the pillars of the house.

There is only one reason that legislation of this kind is here before us today. It is that the American people have the overwhelming conviction that someone whose job it was to administer certain immigration and naturalization laws has fallen down on the job in the face of a threatening situation.

It is a similar conviction that finally reached the head of the present administration that resulted in the reorganization order that transferred the Bureau of Immigration from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice, which is effective today. Four-sevenths of the personnel of the Labor Department will be transferred under that order, I am told. It is a shocking thing, that such a step is taken as a means to correct that situation.

This is a shocking thing—the passage of a bill to deport one alien, but it represents the determination of Americans to do something about a situation they do not approve.

They are tired of sit-down strikes fomented by self-styled leaders who disregard the rights and desires of a vast majority of the workers. They are tired of aliens who seem glad to come here to reap what they can, but who avoid the vows and the responsibilities of citizenship. We have been told here today that this man Bridges four times took out his first papers, but as many times went no further.

This bill may be unconstitutional; the lawyers here seem divided on that question; the balance of us can only register the heart and mind of America on the broad question involved.

Can an alien come to this country, engage in I. W. W. activities when the country is at war, as Bridges did in 1918; file false statements regarding his marital relationships, as Bridges did; work himself into control of destructive radical labor groups and lead them into sit-down strikes, taking possession of the property of other persons, violating the rights and desires of other workmen to work, disrupting the country's ability to produce and to carry its produce even in a time of national emergency—can a man, an alien, do these things and retain the welcome of the country where he is a guest?

Cannot the Congress which passes laws, both general and individual, that permit an alien's entry, also pass a law to deport the alien who outrages the hospitality he accepts?

That, as far as the American public is concerned, is the principle involved. And in this time when America is looking to her defenses, there is only one answer. We have been told that the passage of this bill would be a blot on our history. The blot in history will be of those democracies that fail to assert the inherent rights in sovereignty of keeping out or kicking out those aliens who are or who become enemies of national security. Let this be known as the day when America takes charge of her own destiny. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAGNUSON: Strike out all after enacting clause and insert "That any alien who, at any time after entering the United States, is found to have been at the time of entry, or to have become thereafter, a member of the Nazi, Fascist, or Communist Party, or who advises, advocates, or teaches the doctrines of nazism, fascism, or communism, or who is a member of, or affiliated with, any organization, association, society, or group, that advises,

advocates, or teaches the doctrines of nazi-ism, fascism, or communism, shall, upon the warrant of the Secretary of Labor, be taken into custody and deported in the manner provided in the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917."

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I doubt that that amendment should be voted on, as it is general legislation, and we have before us a private bill, not general legislation. The amendment is not germane to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan make a point of order against the amendment?

Mr. LESINSKI. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is why I have submitted the amendment. I think there should be general legislation on this subject rather than specific legislation.

Mr. LESINSKI. I agree with the gentleman that there should be general legislation, but it is a private bill we are discussing today, and the amendment is not germane to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON] was in the nature of general legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. No point of order was made against that amendment. If one had been made, it would have been sustained.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

All time has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be reported so the Members may know what it provides.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the O'Connor amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CALDWELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9766) to authorize the deportation of Harry Renton Bridges, pursuant to House Resolution 511, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the Van Zandt amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know who has the privilege of offering a motion to recommit. If a gentleman on the minority side is ready to offer a motion to recommit, is he not entitled to recognition for that purpose?

The SPEAKER. The rule is that a minority Member who qualifies as being opposed to the bill is entitled to recognition

if that point is raised. Does the gentleman raise that question?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes; I certainly do.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Connecticut opposed to the bill?

Mr. MILLER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER moves to recommit the bill H. R. 9766 to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 330, nays 42, answered "present" 1, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 151]

YEAS—330

Alexander	Cummings	Hope	Monkiewicz
Allen, Ill.	Curtis	Horton	Moser
Allen, La.	D'Alesandro	Houston	Mouton
Allen, Pa.	Davis	Hull	Mundt
Andersen, H. Carl	Delaney	Hunter	Murray
Anderson, Mo.	Dempsey	Jarman	Myers
Andersen, A. H.	DeRouen	Jarrett	Nelson
Angell	Dies	Jeffries	Nichols
Arends	Dirksen	Jenkins, Ohio	Norrell
Arnold	Disney	Jennings	O'Brien
Austin	Ditter	Jensen	O'Leary
Ball	Dondero	Johns	Oliver
Barnes	Doxey	Johnson, Ill.	Osmer
Barry	Dworshak	Johnson, Ind.	O'Toole
Bates, Mass.	Eaton	Johnson, Luther A.	Pace
Beam	Edmiston	Johnson, Lyndon	Parsons
Beckworth	Elliott	Johnson, Okla.	Patman
Bell	Ellis	Johnson, W. Va.	Patrick
Bender	Elston	Jones, Ohio	Patton
Blackney	Engel	Jones, Tex.	Pearson
Bland	Englebright	Jonkman	Peterson, Fla.
Bloom	Evans	Kee	Peterson, Ga.
Boehne	Faddis	Kefauver	Pittenger
Boland	Fenton	Kelly	Plumley
Bolles	Ferguson	Kennedy, Md.	Poage
Bolton	Fernandez	Kennedy, Michael	Polk
Boren	Fish	Keogh	Powers
Boykin	Fitzpatrick	Kerr	Rabaut
Bradley, Mich.	Flaherty	Kilburn	Ramspeck
Bradley, Pa.	Flannery	Kilday	Randolph
Brewster	Ford, Leland M.	Kinzer	Rankin
Brooks	Ford, Miss.	Kitchens	Rayburn
Brown, Ga.	Fulmer	Kleberg	Reece, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Gamble	Kocalkowski	Reed, Ill.
Bryson	Garrett	Kramer	Reed, N. Y.
Buck	Gartner	Kunkel	Rees, Kans.
Buckler, Minn.	Gathings	Lambertson	Rich
Bulwinkle	Gavagan	Landis	Richards
Burdick	Gearhart	Lanham	Robinson, Utah
Burgin	Gehrmann	Larrabee	Robson, Ky.
Byrne, N. Y.	Gerlach	Lea	Rockefeller
Byrns, Tenn.	Gibbs	LeCompte	Rodgers, Pa.
Byron	Gifford	Lesinski	Rogers, Mass.
Caldwell	Gilchrist	Lewis, Colo.	Rogers, Okla.
Camp	Gillie	Lewis, Ohio	Romjue
Cannon, Fla.	Goodwin	Ludlow	Routzohn
Cannon, Mo.	Gore	Lynch	Rutherford
Carlson	Gossett	McAndrews	Ryan
Carter	Graham	McCormack	Sandager
Cartwright	Grant, Ala.	McDowell	Sasser
Case, S. Dak.	Grant, Ind.	McGehee	Schafer, Wis.
Chapman	Green	McGregor	Schiffler
Chiperfield	Gregory	McKeough	Schuetz
Church	Griffith	McLaughlin	Schulte
Clark	Gross	McLean	Schwert
Clason	Guyer, Kans.	McLeod	Scrugham
Claypool	Gwynne	McMillan, Clara	Secombe
Clevenger	Hall, Edwin A.	McMillan, John L.	Secrest
Cluett	Hall, Leonard W.	Maclejewski	Seger
Coffee, Nebr.	Halleck	Mahon	Shafer, Mich.
Cole, Md.	Hancock	Maloney	Sheppard
Colmer	Hare	Mansfield	Short
Cooper	Harness	Marshall	Simpson
Corbett	Harrington	Martin, Ill.	Smith, Maine
Costello	Harter, N. Y.	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Ohio
Courtney	Harter, Ohio	Martin, Mass.	Smith, W. Va.
Cox	Hartley	Mason	Snyder
Cravens	Hawks	Massingale	Somers, N. Y.
Crawford	Healey	May	South
Creal	Hendricks	Michener	Sparkman
Crowe	Hinshaw	Mills, Ark.	Spence
Crowther	Hoffman	Mills, La.	Springer
Cullen	Holmes	Mitchell	Starnes, Ala.

Stearns, N. H.
Stefan
Sumner, Ill.
Summers, Tex.
Sweet
Taber
Talle
Tarver
Taylor
Thill

Thomas, N. J.
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Thorkelson
Tibbott
Treadway
Van Zandt
Vinson, Ga.
Vorys, Ohio
Vreeland

Ward
Warren
Weaver
West
Wheat
Wheelchel
White, Ohio
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Williams, Del.

Williams, Mo.
Winter
Wolcott
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodruff, Mich.
Youngdahl
Zimmerman

NAYS—42

Barton, N. Y.
Casey, Mass.
Celler
Cochran
Coffee, Wash.
Connelly
Dickstein
Dingell
Dunn
Eberhart
Edelstein

Ford, Thomas F.
Fries
Geyer, Calif.
Hart
Havenner
Hennings
Hill
Hobbs
Izac
Keller
Kennedy, Martin

Leavy
Luce
Marcantonio
Miller
Murdock, Ariz.
Murdock, Utah
Norton
O'Connor
O'Day
O'Neal
Pierce

Sabath
Shanley
Sheridan
Smith, Conn.
Smith, Ill.
Smith, Wash.
Terry
Voorhis, Calif.
Wadsworth

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Magnuson

NOT VOTING—58

Anderson, Calif.
Andrews
Barden, N. C.
Bates, Ky.
Buckley, N. Y.
Burch
Cole, N. Y.
Collins
Cooley
Cresser
Culkin
Darden, Va.
Darrow
Doughton
Douglas

Drewry
Duncan
Durham
Fay
Flannagan
Folger
Hess
Hook
Jacobsen
Jenks, N. H.
Kean
Keefe
Kirwan
Knutson
Lemke

McArdle
McGranery
Maas
Merritt
Monroney
Mott
Pfeifer
Risk
Robertson
Sacks
Satterfield
Schaefer, Ill.
Shannon
Smith, Va.
Steagall

Sullivan
Sutphin
Sweeney
Tenerowicz
Tinkham
Tolan
Vincent, Ky.
Wallgren
Walter
Welch
White, Idaho
Wood
Woodrum, Va.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Barden of North Carolina (for) with Mr. Magnuson (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Fay with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Robertson with Mr. Mott.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Darden of Virginia with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Hook with Mr. Darrow.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Risk.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Monroney.
Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Cresser with Mr. Bates of Kentucky.
Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Tolan.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Folger.
Mr. Collins with Mr. McArdle.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Duncan.
Mr. McGranery with Mr. Tenerowicz.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Sachs.
Mr. Durham with Mr. White of Idaho.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Wallgren.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BARDEN, and therefore I withdraw my vote of "nay" and answer "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

PRIZE-FIGHT FILMS

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 524

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 2047, an act to divest prize-fight films of their character as subjects of interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,

the bill shall be read for amendments under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

VESSELS AFFECTED BY THE NEUTRALITY ACT OF 1939

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 523

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 260, a joint resolution to make emergency provision for the maintenance of essential vessels affected by the Neutrality Act of 1939, and for adjustment of obligations with respect to such vessels. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

House Resolution 522

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 6572, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for marine war-risk insurance and reinsurance and for marine-risk insurance, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

MEDITERRANEAN FRUITFLY ERADICATION

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 40), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 40

Whereas pursuant to Senate Joint Resolution 177, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, a subcommittee of the Committee on Claims of the Senate has held a hearing with respect to the losses sustained by certain persons in the State of Florida as a result of the Mediterranean fruitfly eradication and quarantine campaign conducted in the State of Florida by the United States Government; and

Whereas in the opinion of such subcommittee a satisfactory showing has been made to justify and require an accurate and dependable determination of the actual losses sustained as a result of such campaign, the nature and character of such losses, and the persons by whom such losses were sustained: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby created a special joint congressional committee to be composed of three members of the Committee on Claims of the Senate, to be appointed by the chairman thereof, and three members of the Committee on Claims of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the chairman of such committee. It shall be the duty of such special committee to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the losses sustained as a result of the Mediterranean fruitfly eradication and quarantine campaign conducted in the State of Florida in 1929 and 1930 by the United States Government, with a view to determining, among other things, the nature, character, and amount of such losses, the circumstances under which such losses occurred, and the persons by whom such losses were sustained. The committee shall report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the

sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-sixth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

NONRECOGNITION OF TRANSFER OF ANY GEOGRAPHIC REGION IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 525), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

House Resolution 525

Resolved, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of House Joint Resolution 556, a joint resolution approving nonrecognition of the transfer of any geographic region in the Western Hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power, and providing for consultation with other American republics in the event that such transfer should appear likely. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MAY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3840) to amend the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes", approved June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a bill that I introduced today providing for the training of civilians, and ask that I may have permission to slightly exceed the limitations on printing, to include the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include three short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today, and to include certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, in this great program of national defense, the problem of the training of our young men becomes of paramount importance, not only training in war, but industrial training. In talking with some of my colleagues I find that we are not yet certain about educational plans which we think ought to be completed. It has been suggested to me that as many as are interested in vocational or industrial education as a back-

ground for national defense should meet in the caucus room in the House Office Building tomorrow morning at 10:30 o'clock and discuss ways, means, and methods of assuming this vital part of our defense program.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman is doing a very fine thing, and I should be very glad to be present.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I trust every Member interested in the matter will be present.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the Bridges bill passed this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with the remarks I made today I may include therein certain brief excerpts from court decisions and some newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Admiral Peary and by Professor Griswold.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two short newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks which I made today and include a few additional extracts from the Communist pamphlet entitled "Why Communism?" by M. J. Olgin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "Electric Power for National Needs" appearing in the Jersey Shore Herald, May 29.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXPLANATION

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. KEEFE, was unavoidably detained this afternoon on the last roll call. Had he been present he would have voted "aye."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for reasons previously stated I object to such breaches of the rules. Members who make such announcements are violating the law of the House and know they are violating the law of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief extract of an article by Gen. Hugh S. Johnson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include excerpts from two editorials in the remarks I made today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. GREGORY (at the request of Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky), for today, on account of official committee business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2598. An act for the relief of Kurt Wessely;

S. 3196. An act to amend the act approved May 24, 1938, entitled "An act for the relief of the Comision Mixta Demarcadora de Limites Entre Colombia y Panama" and for the relief of Jose Antonio Sossa D;

S. 4026. An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the Bureau of Labor Statistics to collect information as to amount and value of all goods produced in State and Federal prisons.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6044. An act to regulate the number of warrant and commissioned warrant officers in the Marine Corps;

H. R. 6446. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to construct, equip, maintain, and operate on Farm Island, S. Dak., certain amusement and recreational facilities, to charge for the use thereof, and for other purposes";

H. R. 8026. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9209. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9848. An act to authorize the construction or acquisition of naval aircraft, the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 14, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

On Friday, June 14, 1940, at 10 a. m., a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will hold a hearing on H. R. 10065, now pending in the Senate on investment companies.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Friday, June 14, 1940, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 9706, to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. Proponents only will be heard Friday. Hearings will be held in room 536, Old House Office Building.

LXXXVI—517

COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

The Subcommittee on Mines and Mining that was appointed to consider S. 2420 will continue hearings on Friday, June 14, 1940, at 10 a. m., in the committee rooms in the New House Office Building.

MEETING OF IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION COMMITTEE

The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation will meet at 10:30 a. m., Friday, June 14, in room 128, House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 8078.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization Wednesday, June 19, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of private bills and unfinished business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1758. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 29, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Little Missouri River, Ark., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, and by act of Congress approved May 6, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 837); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1759. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 11, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers and their tributaries, and Ballona Creek, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, and June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 838); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1760. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 13, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on reexamination of Little Narragansett Bay and Watch Hill Cove, R. I., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted January 24, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 839); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1761. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 6, 1940, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on reexamination of Cape Charles City Harbor, Va., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted May 24, 1939, and the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted June 13, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 8353. A bill to change the designation of the Fort Marion National Monument, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2520). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HORTON: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 8448. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil- and gas-prospecting permits; without amendment (Rept. No. 2521). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 8646. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain patented lands in the Death Valley National Monument for Government lands in the monument; with amendment (Rept.

No. 2522). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEBOUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 9732. A bill relating to the issuance by the Secretary of the Interior of a patent to the State of Minnesota for certain lands in that State; without amendment (Rept. No. 2523). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PATRICK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3780. An act authorizing Alabama Bridge Commission (an agency of the State of Alabama) to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge and causeway between Dauphin Island and the mainland at or near Cedar Point, within the State of Alabama; without amendment (Rept. No. 2524). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 3807. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Arrow Rock, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2525). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9509. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2526). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9561. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Minnesota Department of Highways and the counties of Benton and Stearns in Minnesota, to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2527). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PEARSON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9678. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Memphis, Tenn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2528). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9828. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of bridges across the Monongahela River in Allegheny County, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2529). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9920. A bill authorizing the county of Lawrence, Ohio, to acquire and operate as a unit certain privately owned toll bridges across the Ohio River adjoining such county; with amendment (Rept. 2530). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9954. A bill to amend section 7 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 326; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 753f), relating to places of confinement and transfers of persons convicted of an offense against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 9931. A bill to increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 9930. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 524. Resolution for the consideration of S. 2047, an act to divest prize-fight films of their character as subjects of interstate or foreign commerce, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. 2540). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 523. Resolution for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 260, joint resolution to make emergency provision for the

maintenance of essential vessels affected by the Neutrality Act of 1939, and for adjustment of obligations with respect to such vessels; without amendment (Rept. No. 2541). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 522. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6572, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for marine war-risk insurance and reinsurance and for marine risk reinsurance, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2542). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. H. R. 3840. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 2543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. Senate Concurrent Resolution 40. Concurrent resolution creating a special joint committee to investigate the matter of losses resulting from the Mediterranean fruitfly eradication campaign in Florida in 1929 and 1930; without amendment (Rept. No. 2544). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 525. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 556, a joint resolution approving nonrecognition of the transfer of any geographic region in the Western Hemisphere from one non-American power to another non-American power, and providing for consultation with other American republics in the event that such transfer should appear likely; without amendment (Rept. No. 2545). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 4628. A bill for the relief of John C. Gibbs; without amendment (Rept. No. 2518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HART: Committee on War Claims. S. 1076. An act for the relief of the widow of the late William J. Cocke; without amendment (Rept. No. 2519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EBERHARTER: Committee on Claims. S. 527. An act for the relief of J. J. Greenleaf; with amendment (Rept. No. 2531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Claims. S. 2800. An act for the relief of Edward J. Ross, and the legal guardian of Betty Ross, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 2532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EBERHARTER: Committee on Claims. S. 3280. An act for the relief of the estate of Leslie Everett, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 2533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2278. A bill for the relief of Carl Hurt; without amendment (Rept. No. 2534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3992. A bill for the relief of Frank Spears; without amendment (Rept. No. 2535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 9987. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to donate on behalf of the United States to H. S. Scott, D. W. Collins, Fred M. Gross, trustees, Ashland District Council, Boy Scouts of America, the log house known as the John Secest home, located on the site of the Federal Correctional Institution near Ashland, Ky.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4815. A bill for the relief of Henry J. Wise; with amendment (Rept. No. 2546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5314. A bill for the relief of Paul J. Kohanik; with amendment

(Rept. No. 2547). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6740. A bill for the relief of the estate of J. L. Fretwell; with amendment (Rept. No. 2548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7416. A bill for the relief of Theodore R. King; without amendment (Rept. No. 2549). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7668. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Buxton Hospital; with amendment (Rept. No. 2550). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7957. A bill for the relief of Willie Perry; with amendment (Rept. No. 2551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8217. A bill for the relief of Thomas R. Fox; without amendment (Rept. No. 2552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8246. A bill for the relief of Peter Caletti; with amendment (Rept. No. 2553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8504. A bill for the relief of Dr. A. C. Wade; with amendment (Rept. No. 2554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SASSCER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8946. A bill for the relief of Rufus K. Sanderlin; with amendment (Rept. No. 2555). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9934. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Theodore R. Troendle, for the Dawson Springs Construction Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2556). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9770) for the relief of Julius Meyer; Committee on Claims discharged and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 9933) for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 10052) for the relief of Fred Heihei; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H. R. 10074. A bill to establish schools and camps for the military instruction and training of civilians; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 10075. A bill to provide revenue, equalize taxation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 10076. A bill to increase the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 10077. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 10078. A bill to require the registration of certain organizations carrying on activities within the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 10079. A bill to make certain practices in connection with "open cut" or "strip" mining of bituminous coal unfair methods of competition under the Bituminous Coal Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 10080. A bill to amend section 3493 of the Internal Revenue Code, formerly section 404 of the Sugar Act of 1937; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 10081. A bill to provide for 5-day, 40-hour week, for all civilian employees, in the War Department of the United States Government; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 10082 (by request). A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, as amended June 20, 1939; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANDAGER:

H. R. 10083. A bill to provide for the admission of British, French, Belgian, and Dutch children to the United States for the duration of the present European war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 10084. A bill to protect certain of the Nation's interests and institutions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 10085 (by request). A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, as amended June 20, 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 570. Joint resolution to repeal the Neutrality Act of 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 571. Joint resolution to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice to conduct investigations in the interests of national defense, and for that purpose to permit wire tapping in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FADDIS:

H. R. 10086. A bill for the relief of David Jacobson; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 10087. A bill for the relief of the Continental Aero-surveys Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 10088. A bill for the relief of Leopold Mogger (Geiger); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. YOUNGDAHL:

H. R. 10089 (by request). A bill for the relief of Charles E. Duncan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8728. By Mr. BROOKS: Petition of the executive committee of Herndon Chapter, National Aeronautical Association of Mansfield, La., providing for complement of airplanes and for pilot training at each landing field in the United States having a listed landing field and facilities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8729. By Mr. HARE: Memorial of the Lions Club of Greenwood, S. C., approving and urging appropriate legislation for national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8730. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of the Mexia Chamber of Commerce, of Mexia, Tex., favoring the furnishing of all materials necessary to aid the Allies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8731. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the American Federation of Labor, adopted at the fifty-ninth

annual convention held at Cincinnati, Ohio, concerning adequate protection for the sugar-refinery workers in any sugar legislation by Congress in 1940, also opposing importation of refined sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8732. Also, petition of the National Association of Postmasters, adopted at their sixth annual convention at Buffalo, N. Y., expressing approval of the national-defense system as submitted by President Roosevelt to the Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8733. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning our national defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8734. Also, petition of the National Association of Postmasters and National Association of Postal Supervisors, New York State branch, Buffalo, N. Y., approving the President's national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8735. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the sugar workers conference, Washington, D. C., opposing House bill 9654 and the importation of tropically refined sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8736. Also, petition of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, East River Lodge, No. 829, New York City, protesting against importation of tropically refined sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8737. Also, petition of the New York State Federation of Labor, Albany, N. Y., favoring the passage of the housing bill (S. 591); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

8738. By Mr. SANDAGER: Memorial of the delegates of Rhode Island State Elks Association, Elks Home, Providence, R. I.; endorsing all the efforts being made by the President and by Congress to make this Nation impregnable from outside assault; also endorsing the activities of the Dies committee; to the committee on Military Affairs.

8739. By Mr. SCHWERT: Resolution of the New York State branch of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, endorsing the President's national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8740. Also, resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, State of New York, opposing the State Department's ruling relative to passport requirements for Canadian citizens, and urging the cancelation of this order; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8741. By Mr. VREELAND: Concurrent resolution adopted by the House of Assembly of New Jersey, regarding the establishment of a drydock and shipyard on the New Jersey side of the port of New York adequate for the largest naval and mercantile ships; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

8742. The SPEAKER: Petition of the Amarillo Lions Club, Amarillo, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8743. Also, petition of the Fur Floor and Shipping Clerks' Union, Local 125, New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 9858, immigration legislation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8744. Also, petition of the Bronx Peoples Culture Center, Bronx, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 9858, to promote the national defense, etc., program; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8745. Also, petition of the American College of Radiology, New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

8746. Also, petition of the sugar workers conference, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 9654, agriculture legislation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8747. Also, petition of the Bakery and Confectionery Workers, International Union of America, Brooklyn, N. Y.,

petitioning consideration of their resolutions with reference to immigration legislation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8748. By Mr. HARTER of New York: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, N. Y., opposing the State Department's ruling relative to passport requirements for Canadian citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 14, 1940

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 28, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who knowest our every changing thought, who alone canst fill our life with holy purpose: Help us in these troublous days by discipline, industry, and prayer so to purify our hearts and minds that the sense of our intimacy with Thee may beget in us an ever-increasing self-respect which comes only to those who scorn to give less than their all in the service of their country.

On this day of national import help us to realize that our flag is the sacrament and sign of our affection, patriotism, and devotion to duty and stands for those noblest qualities that represent the spirit of America, qualities that must rest upon the conscience and the morality of our people. O'er-shadow us with Thy discernment, that we may grow in knowledge of Thy will, until we shall rise into the rest which it is Thine alone to give. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator withhold the suggestion until the Senate receives a message from the House of Representatives?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 9766. An act to authorize the deportation of Harry Renton Bridges; and

H. R. 9909. An act to amend sections 2803 (c) and 2903 of the Internal Revenue Code.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Michigan withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum until I can have the Journal approved?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly.

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day of Thursday, June 13, 1940, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has suggested the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Burke	Ellender	Hill
Andrews	Byrnes	George	Holman
Ashurst	Capper	Gerry	Holt
Austin	Caraway	Gillette	Hughes
Bailey	Chandler	Green	Johnson, Calif.
Bankhead	Clark, Idaho	Guffey	Johnson, Colo.
Barkley	Clark, Mo.	Gurney	King
Bilbo	Connally	Hale	La Follette
Bone	Danaher	Harrison	Lee
Bridges	Davis	Hatch	Lodge
Brown	Donahey	Hayden	Lucas
Bulow	Downey	Herring	Lundeen